

Thomas Phil Hickman to be postmaster at Monroe, Wash., in place of H. T. Bennett. Incumbent's commission expired January 8, 1936.

Truman W. Chamberlain to be postmaster at Quincy, Wash., in place of W. E. Field, removed.

Ethel R. Hanks to be postmaster at Port Orchard, Wash., in place of Frank Givens, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Bennie D. Wiley to be postmaster at Athens, W. Va., in place of R. P. Oxley. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1936.

Oscar R. Conaway to be postmaster at Barrackville, W. Va., in place of Lawrence Barrackman. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1936.

Harper H. Hudson to be postmaster at Durbin, W. Va., in place of S. A. Willhide. Incumbent's commission expired February 19, 1936.

James B. Shrewsbury to be postmaster at Princeton, W. Va., in place of L. E. White. Incumbent's commission expired February 1, 1936.

WISCONSIN

John W. O'Callaghan to be postmaster at Suring, Wis., in place of N. M. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired April 28, 1934.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 28 (legislative day of May 12), 1936

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Eugene H. Dooman to be consul general of the United States of America.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Carlisle P. Knight to be medical director.

Dr. Carroll E. Palmer to be passed assistant surgeon.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

William F. Twitchell to be naval constructor.

William W. Graham, Jr., to be lieutenant.

Edmund R. Norton to be naval constructor.

Randolph Meade, Jr. to be ensign.

POSTMASTERS

CONNECTICUT

Arthur A. Lawrence, East Berlin.

Clinton A. Theis, Madison.

MINNESOTA

Evelyn I. Reintjes, Big Lake.

Glen M. Squires, Blackduck.

Clifford J. Fitzgerald, Dilworth.

Edward B. Anderson, Elbow Lake.

Joseph O. Ellevoid, Fairfax.

Edna M. Matzke, Hills.

Joseph M. Hilger, Iona.

Robert J. Mayheu, Ironton.

Gordon J. Dewar, Lewisville.

Joseph J. Gaffney, Morris.

Henry Falardeau, Oklee.

Leonard Reiland, Rollingstone.

NEBRASKA

Fay J. Clough, Allen.

C. Glenn Magee, Arapahoe.

Dolores Jensen, Hampton.

Magnus P. Hemmingsen, Marquette.

Orval C. Myers, Nelson.

Harley G. Moorhead, Omaha.

Agnes E. Sullivan, O'Neill.

Bessie A. Freed, Pender.

Martin Slattery, Shelton.

Jake R. Hanks, Thedford.

Elmer L. Bunger, Upland.

J. Marie D. Rutledge, Wilsonville.

NEW YORK

Harry J. Sheridan, McGraw.

OREGON

Delbert E. Pearson, Carlton.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Russell P. Barnett, Campobello.

Bayfield W. Smoak, Moultrieville.

Earle W. Chadwick, Parris Island.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock meridian.

The Reverend Clifford H. Jope, D. D., pastor of the Ninth Street Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our divine Father, we thank Thee for the rich heritage which is ours from the years that are passed. It seems to us today that every privilege we enjoy is tinged with the red blood of the Nation's patriots.

We are grateful to Thee and to them for liberty and the opportunity to achieve, for safety and the institutions that nurture and protect us.

We praise Thee for the men and women among us who have consecrated themselves to the Nation's good. Grant, O Father, enlightenment in the making of laws and the compulsion of Thy spirit in the creation of a wider fraternal sympathy and comradeship between men. Give the necessary inspiration to enable us to seek and achieve peace and happiness. Free us from secret and open iniquity. Save us from dark forces that seek to destroy.

Grant to the President and all who share in the government of the realm the guidance of Thy spirit, and use them as ministers in Thy kingdom of truth.

In the spirit of Him who is truth. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4511. An act to amend section 641 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia;

S. 4512. An act to amend section 641 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia;

S. 4533. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wilkersons Ferry, Miss.; and

S. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the city and county of San Francisco to construct a causeway and highways on Yerba Buena Island in San Francisco Bay, and for other purposes.

INTER-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by the American Ambassador to Mexico, on inter-American relations.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBETH. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Josephus Daniels, American Ambassador to Mexico, at the luncheon of the Mexico City Lion's Club in honor of the proposal of the President of the United States of America, Franklin D. Roosevelt, to group in one sole social and economic idea all the free nations on this continent, March 5, 1936:

The Lions International of Mexico City, the largest club of your organization in the world, emphasizes its cardinal principle of promoting peace by this luncheon given in honor of President Roosevelt. You meet today in recognition of his epoch-making action looking toward the undergirding of lasting understanding between the 21 democratic countries on this continent. This appreciation

of the President of my country by the Lions International of Mexico City emphasizes the importance of the proposed extraordinary inter-American conference as well as the spirit and purpose of your organization, which is quick to further all agencies to cement Pan American devotion to unity of action.

It is gratifying that in this latest step of solidarity on this hemisphere the President of the United States and the President of Mexico see eye to eye. In honoring the Chief Executive of my country you likewise pay tribute to the head of the Mexican Government. Congratulating President Roosevelt on what he characterizes "the nobility of outlook which your suggestion carries", President Cárdenas pledges enthusiastic cooperation, confirming Mexico's "traditional attitude regarding instruments of peace", and expresses faith in the principle of settling differences "without having to take recourse to force as an argument in the place of law."

This approval of the conference by the President of Mexico and the heads of other Pan American governments, to quote Dr. Saavedra Lamas, the Foreign Minister of Argentina, is proof that "for the first time a current of community of ideas and sentiments without suspicions and without ill will" pervades the American republics.

All progress is evolutionary. The proposal of this extraordinary conference is the fruition of the hopes and labors of patriotic men of all Pan America from the battles for freedom through many steps toward continental solidarity. It evidences the growth of the passion for peace and justice which dominates the heart and mind of President Roosevelt. His first utterance as he took the oath of office foreshadowed this latest piece of statesmanship.

Rarely before in history did the people of the world, and particularly on this hemisphere, await an utterance of a new President with such deep interest as on March 4, 1933, when Franklin D. Roosevelt took the oath of office of President of the United States of America. They had not long to wait. In his inaugural address Mr. Roosevelt showed that the New Deal was not confined to feeding the starving or lifting his own country out of the economic morass into which it had fallen. It is well to recall the very words that heartened all who have yearned for the completest understanding and brotherhood of Pan Americans. In a brief statement the new President enunciated a policy which had in it light and cheer. A new-born Pan American unity was ushered into existence by this declaration:

"In the field of world policy I would dedicate this Nation to the policy of the good neighbor—the neighbor who respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others; the neighbor who respects his obligations and respects the sanctity of his agreements in and with a world of neighbors."

A short time thereafter, in an illuminating address before the governing board at a Pan American celebration, President Roosevelt made clear that the Monroe Doctrine was for the protection of the Western Hemisphere against outside aggression, not as a weapon to be employed by one American government against another. He also declared that all unnecessary and artificial barriers and restrictions which hampered the healthy flow of trade between the peoples of the American republics should be abolished.

In his address to the Woodrow Wilson Foundation on December 28, 1933, President Roosevelt quoted with approval the definite statement of President Wilson at Mobile that "the United States would never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest", adding this declaration of his policy: "The time has come to supplement the declaration of President Wilson by the further declaration that the definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention." And he added this statement, which may now be said to be a Roosevelt doctrine:

"The maintenance of constitutional government in other nations is not, after all, a sacred obligation devolving upon the United States alone. The maintenance of law and the orderly processes of government in this hemisphere is the concern of each individual nation within its borders first of all. It is only if and when the failure of orderly processes affects the other nations of the continent that it becomes their concern; and the point to stress is that in such an event it becomes the joint concern of the whole continent in which we are all neighbors."

If President Roosevelt had proclaimed the new doctrine and stopped there, its effect would have been salutary, but would have fallen far short of the desired goal. No one knew better than he that "fair words butter no parsnips." He promptly let his works prove the sincerity of his words. Since March 1933, what acts have shown that the good-neighbor policy is a modern application of the spirit of the Golden Rule? Let us examine the record of the new foreign policy in these 3 years:

1. Only this week an agreement has been reached with Panama to settle long-standing differences in ways mutually satisfactory to the two countries. In addition, Uncle Sam withdraws his big-brother attitude that Panama regarded as treading upon its sovereign rights.

2. Within a year treaties have been negotiated with six Pan American countries which have brought reciprocal and increased trade to those countries, and like reciprocal arrangements will increase the markets and prosperity of all America.

3. The Platt amendment no longer gives the right to the United States to intervene in Cuban affairs. The provision permitting American intervention in Cuba when the restoration of order was deemed necessary by the United States had long rankled among Spanish Americans as an indication of a desire to overlord the smaller countries.

4. Marines, first sent to Haiti, in the days of the World War, have been withdrawn, and the good-neighbor policy practiced in a way that proves genuine friendship and respect for the independence of that country.

5. Cooperation with all Pan American states for the pacific solution of questions which might provoke war.

6. The declaration subscribed to at Montevideo for the United States by the Honorable Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, containing a provision that no State has the right to intervene in the internal or external affairs of another.

7. A recent statement by the Honorable Sumner Welles, Assistant Secretary of State, that "dollar diplomacy, I am glad to say, is now a thing of the past."

These seven concrete steps already taken foreshadow the even more gratifying and far-reaching agreements which will give lasting distinction to the coming extraordinary Inter-American Conference.

Freed from fear of European nations, it is to the glory of this continent that nearly all disputes have been settled by arbitration. The example of Chile and Argentina in thus settling their boundary dispute in 1902 affords an example for world emulation. When that agreement was reached, the people erected a memorial following the example of the men of old, to keep in constant remembrance their high determination. That memorial, erected on the crest of the Andes, took the form of a statue of Christ the Prince of Peace, and it bears this inscription:

"Sooner shall these mountains become dust than that the peoples of Argentina and Chile break the peace which they have pledged at the feet of their Redeemer."

Shortly the extraordinary Inter-American Conference will be held. It will guarantee in our day the long-delayed perfect unity of Pan America for the safeguarding of peace, territorial integrity, and mutual covenants of brotherhood.

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

Mr. PAREDES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAREDES. Mr. Speaker, a former Member of this House has stated, part seriously and part humorously, that if, upon the arrival of the American soldiers, after your admiral had sunk the Spanish fleet, there had been good interpreters in the islands there would have been no Philippine-American war. There may be an element of truth rather than humor in that statement.

When I was a boy of 16 I was one of the very few in a Spanish-controlled country who attempted to speak English. One day a squad of American soldiers called at our home and I was taken to headquarters. The family thought I was about to be shot or imprisoned. Instead I found I was to be used as an interpreter, and was assigned to an American officer then holding a not very high rank. Last week it was my pleasure to dine with this American officer, who is now a general in the United States Army, Maj. Gen. Thomas Q. Ashburn.

I was one of the few interpreters to whom your colleague, former Congressman Hawes, referred.

I make reference to this because I sometimes think what would have happened had there been no Philippine-American war and we had been permitted to work out our destinies in our own way with Spanish sovereignty removed.

It is all a matter of conjecture, but one thing you must admit would have happened. We would at least have had some world trade in markets throughout the world. They might have been small and unsatisfactory, but we would have had them, and in 37 years they might have been developed to large economic importance.

But your Congress decided otherwise. It established reciprocal free trade to secure for your American manufacturers, farmers, and livestock raisers a practical monopoly of the Philippine market until, as you know, it has grown to enormous proportions. It is probably your best market in the world, certainly, for many of your products. In some of your States manufacturers provide economic life for your people. In other States farming is the chief occupation; in other States mining; in other States cattle raising; and prosperity in these States depends not only upon the successful product of these various articles of commerce but upon their sale.

In my country, where we now have some 14,000,000 people, our chief product is sugar, constituting 63 percent of our

exports, and contributing through taxation to the support of our government a great proportion of our national revenue. The fate of our sugar industry will affect our future to a material extent.

The Philippines did not write their own sugar legislation; it was written by your Congress. We had nothing to say about the matter. Its development is your development, not ours.

Fair treatment for our Philippine sugar industry will not injure a single beet-sugar or cane-sugar producer in the United States. The reason is quite apparent. The American people each year consume approximately 6,500,000 tons of sugar, and, because of the limited American production, you are required to purchase at least 4,500,000 tons of sugar from what are called offshore areas, under the American flag, and Cuba, a foreign nation.

We are not seeking and never have sought to take anything away from the beet growers or the cane growers of the United States. All we ask is that, while under the American flag, we be treated fairly and equitably with other Territories and possessions of the United States.

The production of sugar, therefore, is not a controversy between Philippine producers and American producers; it is merely a demand to have our fair share of the business with two American offshore areas. We have no conflict with the domestic continental sugar producer, and we believe he now understands this.

With this in mind, I ask the privilege of extending this discussion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, giving such figures and facts as may be helpful to an understanding of our vital problems.

I make this request because I do not believe the situation is well understood, because I have heard arguments advanced which are not based upon facts and are due, I am sure, to an honest misunderstanding.

THE SUGAR INDUSTRY IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS—THE BACKGROUND

The sugar industry in the Philippine Islands dates back many centuries prior to the American occupation in 1898. Historical records show that the native Filipinos were already producing sugarcane when Magellan discovered the islands in 1521. Exports of sugar from the Philippines increased from 53,000 short tons in 1855 to more than 200,000 short tons 25 years later. The highest export peak during the Spanish regime was reached in 1895, when the Philippines exported 376,401 short tons of sugar.

As a matter of fact, the sugar industry was developed on a competitive level during the Spanish regime and Philippine sugar then was able to compete in the world's markets.

It is interesting and significant to note that for the 10-year period from 1880 to 1889, before the enforcement of the restrictive Spanish commercial laws in the Philippines, of the 200,000 short tons of sugar exported annually, more than 50 percent found its way into the United States, as the following figures indicate:

Year	Total quantity exported (short tons)	Percentage of total value of all exports	Exports to the United States (short tons)	Percentage of total sugar exported
1880.....	199,726	48.65	112,751	56.45
1881.....	230,167	50.47	87,149	37.86
1882.....	165,811	43.22	87,063	52.51
1883.....	216,970	45.83	140,484	64.75
1884.....	134,622	30.33	93,886	69.74
1885.....	225,114	42.18	148,969	66.13
1886.....	203,859	34.90	129,134	63.35
1887.....	189,324	31.66	122,841	64.88
1888.....	177,457	32.32	92,283	52.00
1889.....	251,841	35.45	138,629	55.05
Annual average.....	199,489		115,310	57.80

These figures demonstrate the fact that the United States was, as it is today, the principal market for Philippine sugar. As a result, however, of the restrictive Spanish commercial laws, the sugar exports from the Philippines to the United

States, following the year 1890, decreased to 13 percent, as the following data show:

Year	Total quantity exported (short tons)	Percentage of total value of all exports	Exports to the United States (short tons)	Percentage of total sugar exported
1890.....	159,658	33.72	37,616	23.56
1891.....	152,358	27.29	51,730	33.95
1892.....	278,659	40.54	60,685	18.19
1893.....	288,276	46.74	11,124	3.86
1894.....	232,195	33.11	12,633	5.44
1895.....	376,402	31.34		
Annual average.....	247,924		32,757	13.21

The 6 years of revolution which started in 1896—first, the revolt against Spanish domination from 1896 to 1898; and second, the Philippine insurrection against American occupation, which lasted until 1901—completely paralyzed the basic industries of the islands, including the sugar industry, and not until 10 years thereafter, or until the establishment of the free-trade relations between the United States and the Philippines, did the industry begin to revive.

PHILIPPINES INCREASED ITS SUGAR PRODUCTION LESS THAN OTHER AREAS

It has been erroneously claimed that the Philippines increased its sugar production tremendously and out of proportion in comparison with other sugar-producing areas. The facts are that the Philippine increase in sugar production was relatively much less than that of other sugar-producing countries.

The Philippines reached its pre-war peak production in 1895, prior to American occupation, when it had a production of 431,000 short tons. Its recent peak of production was in the crop year 1933-34, when approximately 1,580,000 short tons was produced. In other words, for a period of 40 years the Philippines increased sugar production 367 percent.

For about the same period Cuba increased its production 489 percent; Puerto Rico, 662 percent; Hawaii, 412 percent; United States (beet), 1,988 percent; Java, 546 percent, as shown by the following record:

	Record production prior to American occupation of Philippines in 1898		Record production in recent years		Percent increase
	Short tons	Year	Short tons	Year	
Cuba.....	1,180,000	1893-94	5,775,000	1928-29	489
Puerto Rico.....	168,000	1879	1,113,000	1933-34	662
Hawaii.....	251,000	1897	1,035,000	1932-33	412
United States (beet).....	87,000	1895	1,730,000	1933-34	1,988
Philippines.....	431,000	1895	1,580,000	1933-34	367
Java.....	602,000	1895	3,292,000	1927-28	546

The recent increase in sugar production in the Philippine Islands was the result of two factors:

First. Replacement of thousands of primitive mills by modern factories, which resulted in the increase in the sugar recovery from the cane from 60 to 95 percent, this improvement having been similarly accomplished in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and other sugar-producing areas when those areas changed their methods of manufacture from the inefficient, antiquated methods to modern practice and equipment; and

Second. Increase in the unit yield per acre as a result of the planting of the same higher yielding varieties that have been utilized in Louisiana, Java, Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and other sugar-producing areas, and the use of fertilizers.

Unlike in Cuba, where there was a tremendous expansion of the sugar industry as a result of the American-Cuban Convention of 1902 and the World War, there has been no extensive expansion of the sugar industry in the Philippine Islands.

Practically the same area of lands devoted to sugarcane during the Spanish regime or prior to American occupation is now utilized for the cultivation of sugarcane, due to the restriction in the land laws enacted by Congress in 1902 limiting the land holdings to not more than 2,500 acres.

Unlike the case in Cuba and other tropical countries, where ownership of sugar-producing lands is confined to a few large proprietors, in the Philippines sugar lands are owned by thousands of farmers, with small holdings of a few acres.

John E. Dalton, formerly chief of the Sugar Section of the A. A. A., commenting upon the increase in production of sugar in Puerto Rico and the Philippines, made the following pertinent remarks: "It should be noted that the increase in the production of sugar in Puerto Rico and the Philippine Islands did not result primarily from an expansion in the acreage under cultivation, but resulted from (a) larger cane tonnage per acre grown (through the substitution of new cane varieties); (b) increase sucrose content in such cane; and (c) improvement in milling which brought an increase in the amount of recoverable sugar from the cane. For example, in the Philippine Islands, between 1923 and 1931, the increase in the amount of sugar available for the United States was 243 percent; however, during that interval the area planted to sugarcane increased by about 13 percent."

FREE TRADE BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES
ESTABLISHED BY YOUR CONGRESS

In carrying out its policy of helping the Filipino people in their economic development, Congress enacted on August 1, 1909, 27 years ago, the Payne-Aldrich bill, which established free trade between the United States and the Philippines, under which all articles exported to the Philippines from the United States were admitted free of duty, and conversely all products from the Philippine Islands coming into the United States, except in any 1 year sugar in excess of 300,000 tons, and other limitations on rice and tobacco.

The limitations on sugar and tobacco were later removed in the Underwood-Simmons Tariff Act of 1913.

The Filipino people opposed the establishment of this free trade on the ground that it "would in the future become highly prejudicial to the economic interests of the Philippine people and would bring about a situation which might hinder the attainment of the independence of said people." But Congress saw fit to establish this relationship, and the Filipino people had to accept their status and planned and worked accordingly their economic development.

It is pertinent to record herein the lofty ideals and sentiments which actuated Congress in establishing this trade relationship with the Philippines.

The then distinguished Republican Senator, Elihu Root, speaking before the Senate of the United States in 1909, when this matter was being debated, said:

The die is cast, Mr. President, upon which we have the responsibility for the Philippine Islands. No action of ours can reverse it. The good faith, the good name, the honor of the American people are all pledged to lead the people of the islands on by paths of growing prosperity and capacity for government to the point where they will be capable of supporting and governing themselves.

We cannot fulfill that high duty by giving them money. * * * Gifts of money tend to reduce the independence of individual character. We cannot fulfill that duty by making the islands unsuccessful in business, by retarding and confining their industry. We can fulfill it only by giving to them the opportunities to national power, to grow in the accumulation of property and the diffusion of wealth, lying at the foundation of civilization. We can fulfill that duty only by making the people of the Philippines at once prosperous and intelligent.

In 1913, when the Democratic Party came into power, the eminent statesman, Oscar Underwood, referring to the removal of the restriction in the act of 1909, spoke as follows on the floor of the House, May 7, 1913: "The change in this paragraph of the bill is largely striking out the limitation on the importation of sugar, filler, and cigar tobacco and wrapper tobacco. * * * We may leave the limit where it is * * * but we would leave it where it is to the shame of every American citizen. We could not honestly face those dependent people who give us free trade in their markets if we close our doors here. * * * Because we do not want to stand and face that world in such a position as that and say (to the Filipinos) that under our law we command you

to open the door, so that American goods can flow to your country, because we have the power to do it, and then turn around and say to them that, on the only thing they can import, practically, into our country and make a market for we will close our doors and prevent them developing their trade. I say that no true-born American citizen who faces the question fairly and squarely and understands the situation will consent to that.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PHILIPPINE SUGAR
INDUSTRY

By virtue of the free trade thus established, sugar from the Philippines received a preferential-tariff position in the American market against Cuban and foreign-grown sugar, thereby placing the sugar industry of the Philippines within the highly American protective tariff walls.

The immediate effect was the investment of American capital in the islands for the development of the sugar industry.

In 1910 a group of American investors established the first modern sugar factory in the island of Mindoro, and 2 years later two other American companies erected sugar centrals at Calamba, on the island of Luzon, and at San Carlos, on the island of Negros.

Thus the modern development of the sugar industry was initiated by pioneering American businessmen and American capital, for it took a decade to convince the Philippine farmers of the advantages of improving their sugar production and manufacture and take advantage of the protection of the American tariff, and not until 1918-21 did the Filipino sugar producers go into the modernization of their methods of manufacture and establish six cooperative sugar centrals with the financial aid of the government Philippine National Bank.

This development of the sugar industry has elevated the living standards of my people and helped them to carry out improvements in education, sanitation, and public works.

The investment in the Philippine Islands in the sugar industry runs over \$250,000,000, largely in the control of Americans and Filipinos.

Like other industries, this business has an association. The president of the association is the Honorable Rafael R. Alunan, known throughout the Philippine Islands and in the United States to be a man of wide experience, given to accuracy of expression and conservative statements.

May I be permitted to quote him regarding investments and other matters relating to the growth of our sugar industry. He states:

The total aggregate investments in the Philippine sugar industry amount to \$251,512,535, as follows:

Investment in centrals.....	\$84,012,535
Investment in lands.....	140,000,000
Crop loans.....	22,500,000
Miscellaneous investments.....	5,000,000
Total	251,512,535

Of the total of \$84,012,535 invested in centrals, 40 percent is American investment, 37 percent Filipino, 22 percent Spanish, and 1 percent cosmopolitan, as shown in the following table:

Nationality	Number of centrals	Total investments	Percentage of total investments
American.....	12	\$33,815,650	40
Filipino.....	22	31,127,894	37
Spanish.....	9	18,270,574	22
Others.....	2	792,417	1
Total.....	45	84,012,535	100

Of the 45 centrals in the Philippine Islands, approximately 24, or more than one-half of them, are small mills, with capacities ranging from 150 to 750 tons of cane per day. Most of these mills are financed by a group of Filipinos, while a few others were established by cosmopolitan investors, including Filipinos, Americans, and others. No Chinese are financially interested in the mills.

Practically all the lands devoted to the cultivation of sugarcane in the Philippines are tilled by Filipinos. Filipinos engaged in sugar cultivation in the Philippines, including their families, number 2,000,000.

Unlike other sugar-producing countries, which must rely on foreign labor to grow sugar, the Philippines depends solely upon native labor for its production of sugar.

Of the 48 Provinces, 17, with a population of over 7,000,000 people, or more than half of the total population of the islands, are directly or indirectly dependent upon the sugar industry.

At least 2,000,000 farmers, laborers, and their families depend for their livelihood upon the growing of sugarcane.

The sugar industry, more than any other industry in the islands, has been responsible for uplifting the standard of living of the Filipino people.

Recognized authorities place the standard of living of the Filipino people 300 percent above that of the peoples of their neighboring countries.

The money spent by the centrals and the planters for the purchase of supplies and materials required by the sugar industry amounts annually to approximately \$30,000,000, or over 60 percent of the total money in circulation in the islands.

The sugar industry is the main support of the Philippine government. For every dollar of value of sugar produced in the Philippines the Philippine government derives in sales tax and other taxes approximately 20 cents.

In 1932 the value of sugar exported from the Philippine Islands constituted 63 percent of the total value of all their exports, as may be seen from the following table:

Value of principal exports from the Philippines for the calendar year 1932

	To all countries		To United States	
	Value	Percent	Value	Percent
1. Sugar and byproducts.....	\$60,339,000	63.31	\$60,145,000	99.64
2. Coconuts and manufactures of...	15,455,000	16.21	12,063,000	78.05
3. Tobacco and manufactures of...	6,399,000	6.71	3,243,000	50.58
4. Manila hemp and manufactures of.....	5,675,000	5.95	1,893,000	33.35
5. Embroideries.....	3,267,000	3.42	3,252,000	99.53
6. Lumber and timber.....	835,000	.87	173,000	20.74
7. Hats.....	591,000	.62	435,000	73.71
8. Pearl buttons.....	244,000	.26	244,000	100.00
9. Other exports.....	2,514,000	2.64	1,200,000	47.73
Total.....	95,339,000	100.00	82,648,000	86.69

The success of the cooperative system which has characterized the production of sugar in the Philippines has made the people realize the advantages of cooperative efforts among small producers and farmers.

In other words, the sugar industry of the Philippines has become a model for a modern scientific development of their other agricultural industries.

AMERICAN INTERESTS IN THE PHILIPPINES

It is obvious from an examination of the records that the free-trade relationship not only has been beneficial to the Philippine Islands but has also been advantageous to the United States.

To the Philippines it meant development of their economic resources, particularly their sugar industry, improvement in their standards of living, successful financing of their government in carrying out its manifold activities; in other words, it meant prosperity for the Filipino people.

It opened to the United States a great Philippine market for American agricultural and industrial products, American shipping, banking, insurance, mining, and other financial enterprises.

During Spanish sovereignty Philippine commerce was diversified throughout the world. The United States sold little to the Philippines—only approximately \$3,000,000, or 3 percent of the Philippine purchases abroad, amounting to \$111,000,000, for the 10-year period 1885-94, prior to American occupation.

With the establishment of free trade the United States has obtained a monopoly of the Philippine market, where it has enjoyed tariff preferences for 97 percent of its products going into the Philippine Islands.

For the last decade, 1924-33, the Philippines purchased from the United States over \$680,000,000 worth of goods, or 61 percent of its total imports from abroad.

The Philippines today is the best market for American cotton cloths, galvanized steel sheets, dairy products, cigarettes, and truck and bus tire casings.

Moreover, the Philippine market is the best in the far-eastern markets for American steel-mill products and iron and steel advanced manufactures.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in its bulletin entitled "Our World Trade" in 1935, reported that

the value of purchases of American merchandise by the Philippines for the calendar year 1935 increased 11.6 percent, while imports of the United States from the islands increased 11.5 percent. For the same period purchases of American merchandise by Cuba increased 32.7 percent, while American imports from Cuba increased 41.9 percent. In this connection the chamber of commerce also reported that while the value of purchases of American merchandise by Japan decreased 3.4 percent, the value of American imports from Japan increased 28.3 percent.

These figures show that the United States, despite the dumping of Japanese goods into the Philippines, has maintained its monopoly of the Philippine market and indicate the stability and potentiality of the Philippine market for American products.

It is to be borne in mind, however, that the continuation of the American monopoly of the Philippine market and control of the economic development of the country depend upon the ability of the Filipino people to market in the United States their basic exportable products, and the continuation, in an equitable and reciprocal manner, of the mutually advantageous economic relationship between the two countries.

WE APPEAL TO AMERICAN FAIRNESS

As already pointed out, our sugar industry has been developed on the basis of free trade with the United States, imposed upon us in the face of our protest.

Being the backbone of our economic life, its ruin and destruction would mean chaos and poverty to our people.

We cannot conceive nor believe that this great Republic would want to destroy the very foundation of our economic existence after it has fostered its development and encouraged us to take advantage of the free-trade relationship it saw fit to give us.

Under the Independence Act the duty-free sugar from the Philippine Islands allowed to come into the United States during the 10-year transition period was limited to 850,000 long tons, equivalent to approximately 973,000 short tons, raw value.

The injustice of this provision of the Independence Act has already been recognized in five instances since its enactment by Congress.

First. The President, in his message to Congress recommending the enactment of the independence bill, suggested changes in this legislation, and stated that "where imperfections or inequalities exist, I am confident that they can be corrected after proper hearing and in fairness to both peoples."

Second. The sugar producers of continental United States, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, after 3 months of conferences and hearings, signed a voluntary marketing agreement in September 1933, under which they conceded to the Philippines an annual quota of export to the United States of 1,100,000 short tons and a reserve of 100,000 short tons, or a total of 1,200,000 short tons available for export to the United States.

Third. In his message to Congress on February 8, 1934, recommending the enactment of legislation stabilizing the sugar industry, the President proposed that the Philippines be given a quota of 1,037,000 short tons.

Fourth. In response to the request of the President, Congress enacted the so-called Jones-Costigan Act under which the Secretary of Agriculture fixed the basic quota for the Philippine Islands at 1,049,000 short tons.

Fifth. Recently, the Secretary of Agriculture, in revising the quotas for 1936, allotted the Philippines a quota this year of 1,068,057 short tons.

It will thus be seen that in every proposal for a sugar stabilization program, the Philippine Islands has been conceded a basic quota of from 1,037,000 to 1,200,000 short tons, and it is undoubtedly the intention in granting this concession to give the Philippines fair and equitable treatment with other areas.

But this intention will be defeated unless the Philippines will be permitted to bring duty-free into the United States its quota under the Jones-Costigan Act, for while the Philippines received this year an increase in its quota by 69,947

tons, it will have to pay the full duty of 1.875 cents per pound on 63,000 tons of this increase by reason of the operation of the duty-free limitation in the Independence Act, effective upon the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth, November 15, 1935.

Prior to the coming into effect of the duty-free limitation of the independence act, on November 15, 1935, the Philippines was entitled to send to the United States all the sugar it could have available for export during the years 1934 and 1935, but because of the enactment of the Jones-Costigan Act, after the Philippines had accepted the Independence Act, the Philippines was compelled to reduce its annual exports to the United States for 1934 and 1935 by 500,000 tons, or a total reduction of 1,000,000 tons for the 2 years, since its normal exports for these years, had there been no quota system, would have averaged 1,500,000 tons annually.

Thus the Jones-Costigan Act, in effect, caused the Philippine producers a loss of \$70,000,000, which loss was reflected in revenues to the Philippine government and the curtailment of the purchases by the Philippines of American products.

This loss, however, was partly compensated by the payment of benefits of thousands of small growers in the islands from the processing tax, but these benefits did not apply to the Philippine sugar factories, as in other Territories and possessions of the United States, and did not compensate the Filipino laborers for the loss they incurred in the reduced sugar production.

Despite the fact that the Philippine sugar producers have shouldered the main burden of the sugar-stabilization program of the administration under the Jones-Costigan Act, they have fully cooperated and assisted in accomplishing its objectives. No serious opposition was encountered, considering the complicated cooperative system of sugar production, involving many thousands of small growers, and no disorders of any kind occurred. On the contrary, the Philippine Legislature, in response to the recommendation of the Governor General, enacted a limitation law restricting the production of sugar in conformity with the quotas established by the Jones-Costigan Act.

In view of the foregoing considerations, it seems, therefore, only fair that the Philippines should be permitted to benefit in the same proportionate degree as the other areas from any increase in quotas consequent to any improvement in consumption by allowing it to bring into the United States, all duty-free, whatever quota it is allotted under the Jones-Costigan Act or substitute bill as long as this quota system is in effect.

The Philippines cannot derive the full benefit of increased quotas because of the operation of the Independence Act, and the equity to us can be given without prejudicing the interests of the producers of continental United States or any of the offshore areas.

The Filipino people will do their utmost to follow the course which Congress charted for them toward their eventual freedom. It is our sincere desire and hope to be able not only to maintain but to improve the peaceful, prosperous, and happy condition in which this great Republic has placed us during the past 35 years.

Looking back to those years, the record will stand out unique in history for the unselfish work and devotion given on behalf of a dependent people, for the complete harmony and friendship between the conqueror and the conquered, and for the early fulfillment of our ideals for freedom without disturbance or bloodshed.

It is a source of pride and satisfaction to the Filipino people to look back to these years and behold that with your guidance we have been able to prosper and go forward on the path of civilization, ourselves paying every dollar required in the administration of our government, keeping absolute peace and public order, and meeting even the havoc of the recent serious depression without appealing for relief.

This achievement is the result of your enlightened guidance, which has given us, to quote the words of the eminent American statesman, "The opportunity to national power, to grow in the accumulation of wealth, lying at the foundation of civilization."

REPORTS FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. O'CONNOR, chairman of the Committee on Rules, by direction of that committee, reported the following privileged resolutions, which were referred to the calendar and ordered printed:

House Resolution 528 (Rept. No. 2834)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order for the Committee on the Judiciary to call up for consideration, without the intervention of any point of order, the following bills:

S. 3389. An act to provide for the appointment of two additional judges for the southern district of New York;

S. 2075. An act to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern and western districts of Missouri;

S. 2137. An act to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern, northern, and western districts of Oklahoma;

S. 2456. An act to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern and southern districts of West Virginia;

H. R. 11072. A bill authorizing the appointment of an additional district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania; and

H. R. 3043. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia.

Each such bill, when called up, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. After general debate on each such bill, which shall continue not to exceed 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

House Resolution 529 (Rept. No. 2835)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order for the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to call up for consideration, without the intervention of any point of order, the following bills and joint resolution:

S. 2912. An act to repatriate native-born women who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 336. Joint resolution to clarify the provisions of section 4 of the act of May 24, 1934, with regard to period of residence required of an alien husband of a citizen of the United States as a prerequisite to naturalization;

H. R. 3472. A bill to amend section 23 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874);

H. R. 7221. A bill to authorize the shortening or termination of the stay in the United States of certain aliens not admitted for permanent residence, to authorize the deportation of certain aliens admitted for permanent residence, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12325. A bill to protect for American actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, and orchestral conductors the artistic and earning opportunities in the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5799. A bill to declare that a citizen of the United States who votes in a political election in a foreign state loses his citizenship; and

H. R. 3023. A bill to provide for citizenship to persons born in the United States who have not acquired any other nationality by personal affirmative act but who have heretofore lost their United States citizenship through the naturalization of a parent under the laws of a foreign country, and for other purposes.

Each such bill and joint resolution, when called up, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. After general debate on each such bill, which shall continue not to exceed 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

House Resolution 530 (Rept. 2836)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 11369, a bill "To authorize the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the Navy." And all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

House Resolution 498 (Rept. 2837)

Resolved, That rule XXI, clause 3, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent, to any other than the following named committees, namely: To the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to the Committee on Pensions, to the Committee on Claims, to the Committee on War Claims, to the Committee on the Public Lands, and to the Committee on Accounts."

Mr. GREENWOOD, from the Committee on Rules, by direction of that committee, reported the following privileged resolution, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed.

House Resolution 531 (Rept. No. 2838)

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of S. 4020, an act "To authorize the acquisition of lands in the city of Alameda, County of Alameda, State of California, as a site for a naval air station and to authorize the construction and installation of a naval air station thereon." And all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 110]

Adair	Dear	Huddleston	Powers
Andrew, Mass.	Duffey, Ohio	Jenckes, Ind.	Rayburn
Andrews, N. Y.	Dunn, Miss.	Jones	Rogers, N. H.
Barden	Englebright	Kee	Sandlin
Blackney	Ferguson	Kopplemann	Schaefer
Brennan	Fernandez	Lambertson	Sears
Brooks	Fish	Lanham	Short
Buckley, N. Y.	Gasque	Lee, Okla.	South
Bulwinkle	Gearhart	Lehlbach	Stewart
Caldwell	Green	Lewis, Md.	Tinkham
Cannon, Wis.	Gwynne	McGroarty	Utterback
Carmichael	Hartley	Mitchell, Ill.	Wadsworth
Cary	Hennings	Montet	Werner
Casey	Hill, Samuel B.	Nichols	Wigglesworth
Clairborne	Hoepfel	Norton	Wilcox
Colmer	Holmes	Oliver	Williams
Corning	Hook	O'Malley	Wood
Cox	Hope	Peterson, Fla.	Zimmerman

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

THE TOWNSEND OLD-AGE-PENSION PLAN

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Select Committee Investigating Old Age Pensions, I present a privileged report (Rept. No. 2857) and send it to the Clerk's desk, and ask that the Clerk read it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

REPORT AND CERTIFICATION OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE OLD AGE PENSION PLANS

The Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans, proceeding as directed by House Resolution 443 to inquire into old-age-pension plans, with respect to which legislation has been submitted to the House of Representatives, and particularly that embodied in H. R. 7154 in the United States Congress, caused to be issued a subpoena directing one Francis E. Townsend to appear before said select committee and to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation by said committee, the subpoena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"By authority of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America

"TO THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OR HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER:

"You are hereby commanded to summon Dr. Francis E. Townsend to be and appear before the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Hon. C. JASPER BELL is chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 443, in their chamber, more specifically described as the caucus room, old House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on May 5, 1936, at the hour of 10 o'clock, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee.

"Herein fall not and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 20th day of April 1936.

"(Signed) JOSEPH W. BYRNS, Speaker.

"Attest:

"(Signed) SOUTH TRIMBLE, Clerk.

Said subpoena was on April 22, 1936, served upon said Francis E. Townsend by a deputy sergeant at arms, empowered by said House of Representatives to perform such act. The return of service of said deputy sergeant at arms being endorsed thereon which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpoena for Dr. Francis E. Townsend, before the Committee on the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations. Served Lafayette Hotel, Sixteenth and I Streets NW., Washington, D. C., April 22, 1936, 9 a. m. William A. Weber, Deputy Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives."

Said Francis E. Townsend, pursuant to said subpoena and in compliance therewith, appeared before the said committee to give such testimony as might be requested or required under and by virtue of House Resolution 443.

Said Francis E. Townsend after being duly sworn by the chairman, testified before said committee on May 19, 20, and 21, 1936. On May 21, 1936, as the examination of said Francis E. Townsend was proceeding shortly before the regular noon adjournment the following colloquy occurred:

"Dr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, this is all rather soporific. May I be excused 5 minutes?

"(Thereupon a short recess was taken.)

"The CHAIRMAN. Adjourn until 2:30.

"(Accordingly at 11:35 o'clock a. m. the select committee stood in recess until 2:30 o'clock p. m.)"

At the afternoon session, convening at 2:30 o'clock p. m., a quorum of said committee being present, composed of the following members: C. Jasper Bell (chairman), Joseph A. Gavan, Sam L. Collins, Scott W. Lucas, John H. Tolan, John B. Hollister, and Clare E. Hoffman, the following colloquy occurred:

"The CHAIRMAN. The committee will come to order.

"Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Bell, Dr. Townsend asked me to tell the committee that he could not be here until 3:30, but will be here at that time.

"The CHAIRMAN. I think we have another witness whom we can put on for a short time, have we not?

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Yes, sir.

"The CHAIRMAN. Until 3:30?

"Mr. DOWNEY. Yes, sir.

"Mr. SULLIVAN. Is Dr. Townsend ill, Mr. Downey?

"Mr. DOWNEY. No; the doctor is not ill."

When Francis E. Townsend resumed the stand later in the afternoon, a quorum of the committee being present, C. Jasper Bell (chairman), Joseph A. Gavan, Sam L. Collins, Scott W. Lucas, John H. Tolan, John E. Hollister, the following transpired:

"The CHAIRMAN. Will you take the stand, Dr. Townsend?

"Dr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, before the quiz starts, I have a brief statement which I wish you would allow me to present. It will take but a minute.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is it a written statement, Doctor?

"Dr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

"The CHAIRMAN. Let me see it, Doctor.

"Dr. TOWNSEND (reading). 'Gentlemen, in view of the fact'—"

"The CHAIRMAN. Just a minute. You will have to abide by the ordinary rules. Do you want to submit the statement to the committee?

"Dr. TOWNSEND. I want to read it, and then I will submit it to you.

"The CHAIRMAN. You cannot do that, Doctor. You will have to conform to the usual rules in matters of this sort. If you want to submit it, the committee will be glad to consider it.

"Dr. TOWNSEND. Will you listen a moment to a statement which I have to make, then?

"The CHAIRMAN. Yes, Doctor.

"Dr. TOWNSEND. In view of the apparent unfriendly attitude of this committee and the unfair attitude it has shown to me and the members of my organization, I deem it my duty to say that I shall no longer attend these committee hearings. I am retiring from this sort of an inquisition, and I do not propose to come back again except under arrest. And I do refuse absolutely to make any further statement pertaining to this movement to this committee.

"Thank you and goodbye."

Because of the foregoing the said committee has been deprived of the testimony of said Francis E. Townsend relative to the subject matter which, under House Resolution 443, said committee was instructed to investigate, and the willful and deliberate refusal of the witness to testify further is a violation of the subpoena under which the witness had previously appeared and testified, and his willful refusal to testify further without having been first excused as a witness deprives the said committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States. The Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans, proceeding as directed by House Resolution 443 to inquire into old-age-pension plans, with respect to which legislation has been submitted to the House of Representatives, and particularly that embodied in H. R. 7154 in the United States Congress, caused to be issued a subpoena directed to one Clinton Wunder to appear before said select committee and to testify concerning matters then and there

under investigation by said committee. The subpoena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"TO THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OR HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER:

"You are hereby commanded to summon Clinton Wunder, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York City, N. Y., to be and appear before the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable C. JASPER BELL is chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 443 in their chamber, more specifically described as the caucus room, old House Office Building, in the city of Washington on May 21, 1936, at the hour of 10 o'clock then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee; and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not and make return of this summons. Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 15th day of May 1936.

"JOSEPH W. BYRNS, Speaker.

"Attest:

"SOUTH TRIMBLE, Clerk."

SUBPENA DUCES TECUM

"Come and bring with you the exact copies of your Federal income-tax returns made by you for the years 1934 and 1935, and also that you bring with you the exact copies of any State income-tax return that you have filed for the years 1934 and 1935."

Said subpoena was on the 18th day of May 1936 served upon said Clinton Wunder by the United States marshal, through his deputy for the United States southern district of California, a person empowered by the chairman of the said committee pursuant to House Resolution 443 to perform such act. The return of service of said deputy for the United States marshal is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"RETURN ON SERVICE OF WRIT

"UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

"Southern District of California, ss:

"I hereby certify and return that I served the annexed subpoena on the therein-named Clinton Wunder by handing to and leaving a true and correct copy thereof with him personally at Los Angeles, in said district, on the 18th day of May, A. D. 1936.

"ROBERT E. CLARK,

"United States Marshal.

"By DAVID E. HAYDEN,

"Deputy."

Thereafter the said Clinton Wunder did cause the following telegram to be addressed and delivered to Congressman C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 18, 1936.

HON. C. JASPER BELL,

United States Congress, Official Building:

Subpena just served. West coast speaking engagements previously arranged would bring me back to New York about June 5. Would greatly appreciate your courtesy allowing me to appear then. Telegraph reply Hotel Biltmore. Regards.

CLINTON WUNDER.

That in reply thereto C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee, did cause to be sent and delivered to the said Clinton Wunder the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 19, 1936.

CLINTON WUNDER,

Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Sincerely regret inability to grant continuance. Follow instructions of subpoena. Mandatory you be here Thursday 10 a. m.

C. JASPER BELL, Chairman.

Thereafter the said Clinton Wunder did cause the following telegram to be addressed and delivered to Congressman C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 19, 1936.

Congressman C. JASPER BELL,

House Office Building:

Require telegraphic approval from you stating airplane transportation will be paid for my appearance Thursday morning in Washington before your committee, since I must travel from Los Angeles. Reply Hotel Biltmore, Los Angeles.

CLINTON WUNDER.

That in reply thereto C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee, did cause to be sent and delivered to the said Clinton Wunder the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 19, 1936.

Rev. CLINTON WUNDER,

Hotel Biltmore, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Airplane transportation arranged for call at T. W. A., Los Angeles.

C. JASPER BELL.

Thereafter the said Clinton Wunder did cause the following telegram to be addressed and delivered to Congressman C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 19, 1936.

Congressman C. JASPER BELL,

Personal Delivery, House Office Building:

Downey, our attorney, just wired stating you had extended my time to May 26. Please telegraph me confirming this officially. Thank you.

CLINTON WUNDER.

That in reply thereto C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee, did cause to be sent and delivered to the said Clinton Wunder the following telegram:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 19, 1936.

Dr. CLINTON WUNDER,

Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles, Calif.:

Confirm arrangements with Attorney Downey made today in committee hearing extending your time to May 26.

C. JASPER BELL.

Thereafter the said Clinton Wunder did cause the following telegram to be addressed and delivered to Congressman C. JASPER BELL, chairman of said committee:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 22, 1936.

HON. C. JASPER BELL,

Congressman, House Office Building:

Arriving Washington late Monday, May 25.

Dr. CLINTON WUNDER.

According to the arrangements made by interchange of the above set forth telegrams between the chairman of said committee and the said Clinton Wunder it was understood and agreed that the said Clinton Wunder would appear before the said Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans on May 26, 1936, at 10 o'clock a. m., but that in violation of the mandate provided by the subpoena and in further violation of the agreement to appear at a later date made at the request of Clinton Wunder the said Clinton Wunder failed to appear and be sworn as witness at the meeting of said committee on May 26, 1936, though his name was called as a witness by said committee at that time.

On May 26, 1936, the said committee, because of the willful failure of the said Clinton Wunder to appear and be sworn as a witness, did issue a second subpoena to be served upon Clinton Wunder commanding him to appear at 10 o'clock May 27, 1936, before said committee and to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation by said committee, the subpoena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"TO THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OR HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER:

"You are hereby commanded to summon Dr. Clinton Wunder to be and appear before the Special Investigating of Old Age Pension Organizations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which Hon. C. JASPER BELL is chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 443, in their chamber, more specifically known as the caucus room, old House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on May 27, at the hour of 10 o'clock, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons. Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States, at the city of Washington, this 26th day of May 1936.

"JOSEPH W. BYRNS, Speaker.

"Attest:

"SOUTH TRIMBLE, Clerk."

Said subpoena was, on May 26, 1936, served upon said Clinton Wunder by a person authorized by the chairman of the said committee pursuant to House Resolution 443 to perform such act, the return of service of said deputy being endorsed thereon, which is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for Dr. Clinton Wunder before the special investigating committee served 4:15 p. m. on May 26, 1936, at room 1235, Ambassador Hotel, in Washington, D. C.

"VERNON E. MOORE."

On May 27, 1936, the chairman of the said committee did receive the following letter by registered mail, set forth in words and figures as follows:

[Envelope]

TOWNSEND VISUAL EDUCATION Co.,

905 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

HON. JASPER C. BELL,

CHAIRMAN, BELL COMMITTEE,

UNITED STATES CONGRESS,

Washington, D. C.

[Letter]

OLD AGE REVOLVING PENSIONS, LTD., THE TOWNSEND PLAN, Dr. F. E. TOWNSEND, FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT. OFFICE OF THE NATIONAL BUSINESS MANAGER, 601 SOUTHERN BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

National board of directors: Dr. F. E. Townsend (seal), Frank Arbuckle, J. B. Kiefer, Baxter G. Rankine, Nathan J. Roberts, Gomer Smith, Alfred J. Wright, Clinton Wunder, Gilmour Young. 905 NORTH CHARLES STREET, Baltimore, Md., May 26, 1936.

HON. JASPER C. BELL,

Chairman, Bell Committee, United States Congress,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received transportation from the United States Government from Los Angeles to Washington under the assumption that I would testify in Washington before your committee. Acting under the instructions of Dr. Townsend, I have decided not to testify, and therefore herewith find enclosed a certified check payable to your order in the sum of \$106.89 to reimburse the Government for the amount advanced for my transportation.

Respectfully yours,

CLINTON WUNDER.

Which letter did enclose a remittance by check of \$106.89 on the account of the Townsend Visual Education Co., no. 303, dated Baltimore, Md., May 26, 1936.

At the session of the committee on May 27, 1936, a quorum being present, said witness, Clinton Wunder, was called by the chairman and failed to appear.

Because of the foregoing the said committee has been deprived of the testimony of said Clinton Wunder relative to the subject matter under House Resolution 443 said committee was instructed to investigate, and the willful and deliberate refusal of Clinton Wunder to appear and to be sworn as a witness to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation is a violation of said subpoena and deprives the said committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

The Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans proceeding as directed by House Resolution 443 to inquire into old-age pension plans, with respect to which legislation has been submitted to the House of Representatives, and particularly that embodied in H. R. 7154 in the United States Congress, caused to be issued a subpoena directed to one John B. Kiefer to appear before said select committee and to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation by said committee, the subpoena being set forth in words and figures as follows:

"BY AUTHORITY OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"To the SERGEANT AT ARMS OR HIS SPECIAL MESSENGER:

"You are hereby commanded to summon J. B. Kiefer to be and appear before the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States, of which the Honorable C. JASPER BELL is chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 443, in their chamber, more specifically described as the caucus room, old House Office Building, in the city of Washington, on May 22, 1936, at the hour of 10 o'clock, then and there to testify touching matters of inquiry committed to said committee, and he is not to depart without leave of said committee. Herein fail not, and make return of this summons.

"Witness my hand and the seal of the House of Representatives of the United States at the city of Washington this 15th day of May 1936.

"Attest:

"JOSEPH W. BYRNS, Speaker.

"SOUTH TRIMBLE, Clerk."

Said subpoena was on the 15th day of May 1936 served on J. B. Kiefer by a person empowered by the chairman of the said committee pursuant to House Resolution 443 to perform such act. The return of service of said person is set forth in words and figures as follows:

"Subpena for J. B. Kiefer before the Committee on the Special Investigation of Old Age Pension Organizations served at 4:55 p. m. May 15, 1936, by handing original to him; he waived reading and accepted copy. J. O. Bowen, for Sergeant at Arms, House of Representatives."

At the session of the committee on May 27, 1936, a quorum being present, said witness John B. Kiefer was called by the chairman and failed to appear.

Because of the foregoing the said committee has been deprived of the testimony of said John B. Kiefer relative to the subject matter which, under House Resolution 443, said committee was instructed to investigate, and the willful and deliberate refusal of John B. Kiefer to appear and to be sworn as a witness to testify concerning matters then and there under investigation is a violation of said subpoena and deprives the said committee of necessary and pertinent testimony and places said witness in contempt of the House of Representatives of the United States.

C. JASPER BELL, Chairman.

The SPEAKER. The report is ordered printed.

Mr. BELL rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is recognized to make the point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. But, Mr. Speaker, I rose before the gentleman from Texas made his point of order. I make the point of order that the report is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to make a point of order. The Chair cannot recognize both gentleman at the same time for the same purpose. The gentleman from Texas will state his point of order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that under the Constitution of the United States the House of Representatives of the legislative branch is a separate and distinct department of government from the judiciary, or the courts, that this is undoubtedly a contempt of the House of Representatives, the legislative branch, and is a contempt that should be tried and punished, not by the courts, but by the House of Representatives itself. We

ought not to pass the buck to the courts. We ought to assume the responsibility ourselves.

I admit that all three witnesses clearly are in contempt, and deserve punishment and that the House ought to try these three witnesses, convict them of contempt, and punish all three of them with a heavy fine and send them all to jail, until they can have some respect for the institutions of their country. I therefore make the point of order that the House of Representatives should try its own contempt proceedings and fix its own punishment.

The SPEAKER. That matter is not under discussion now. This is simply a report from a select committee which has been read and which has been ordered printed. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. MONAGHAN. But, Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, my point of order goes to the fact that this report is completely out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. My point of order is briefly this: The committee that was investigating the Townsend old-age pension plan clearly exceeded its bounds. It went beyond the matter of exercising a legislative function. It tried to make criminals out of the witnesses.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order and not undertake to argue.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I am coming to it. I have to have a little time to state my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it and the Chair will rule upon it.

Mr. MONAGHAN. The Chair should be as courteous to me as he would be to a Member of the opposition.

The SPEAKER. The Chair intends to be courteous and is courteous to the gentleman, but the Chair has a right to ask the gentleman to state his point of order. Then it will be determined whether or not the Chair will hear argument upon it.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I may say that if I am not permitted to explain my point of order I shall appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Any argument or explanation is for the benefit of the Chair, and if the Chair is already satisfied, of course, the Chair will not take up the time of the House in ruling upon it. Therefore, the gentleman will first state his point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. The point of order I make is that the committee has exceeded its function in the process of the inquiry that the House authorized it to proceed under.

The SPEAKER. Let the Chair make this statement. That is not under consideration now. This is simply a report of the select committee, and the question as to whether or not the committee has exceeded its authority cannot arise at this time.

Mr. MONAGHAN. But the question that the committee has exceeded its authority is involved in the question of whether or not it shall be permitted to make a report of this sort.

The SPEAKER. The committee is within its right in submitting its report; it is its duty to report what it has done in order that the House may take such action as it determines to take. Therefore, the Chair overrules that point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to lay the appeal of the gentleman from Montana on the table.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were—ayes 230, noes 8.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those favoring taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Five Members have risen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the appeal by the gentleman from Montana from the decision of the Chair was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the select committee, I now present a privileged resolution and send it to the Clerk's desk and ask that it be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 532

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives certify the report of the Select Committee to Investigate Old Age Pension Plans as to the willful and deliberate refusal of Francis E. Townsend, Clinton Wunder, and John B. Kiefer to testify before said committee, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under seal of the House of Representatives, to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Francis E. Townsend, Clinton Wunder, and John B. Kiefer may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that the resolution is not in order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were yeas 265 and noes 8.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. Those who favor taking this vote by the yeas and nays will stand and remain standing until counted. [After counting.] Five Members have arisen, not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is the resolution divisible as to the three gentlemen named?

The SPEAKER. It is not.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri is out of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has been recognized and has the floor.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I make the point of order that the gentleman is proceeding out of order.

The SPEAKER. The point of order is overruled.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, is not that dilatory?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that that appeal be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is inclined to think it is dilatory, but he will allow it this time.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to lay the appeal on the table.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were—yeas 275 and noes 4.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL] is recognized.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Missouri has his secretary on the floor, and is violating the rules of the House in so doing.

The SPEAKER. The Chair overrules the point of order. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will not recognize the appeal because it is clearly dilatory. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BELL].

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot take the gentleman from Missouri off his feet by a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. SWEENEY. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. MONAGHAN. I rise to a point of personal privilege and the privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman cannot take the gentleman from Missouri off his feet by a question of that kind. The question now pending is one involving the privileges of the House.

Mr. MONAGHAN. A question of personal privilege plus the privilege of the House is superior to the privilege of the House alone, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana will take his seat. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, the report and resolution speak for themselves. They make perfectly clear the purpose of the resolution.

Therefore, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of personal privilege and privilege of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, may the Clerk read the last part of the resolution? We could not hear it on account of so much confusion.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The regular order was demanded.

The SPEAKER. The question now pending is a question of the privilege of the House, and that takes precedence over the question of privilege of the gentleman from Montana. There can be only one question of privilege before the House at a time, and one is now pending.

The Clerk will again read the resolution.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to submit a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SWEENEY. Is any time allowed for debate on this resolution?

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is ordered, there will be no time allowed for debate.

Mr. SWEENEY. And if it is voted down, there will be time?

The SPEAKER. That is a question for the House.

The Clerk will again read the resolution.

(The Clerk again read the pending resolution.)

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the previous question be ordered on the resolution?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were—yeas 243 and noes 30.

Mr. SWEENEY and Mr. MONAGHAN asked for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighteen Members have arisen, not a sufficient number. The yeas and nays are refused.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONNERY. During the reading of the resolution there was some confusion and we could not hear part of it. Do I understand that if this resolution is passed, this question will be taken up by the courts and not by the House?

The SPEAKER. That is the object of the resolution, as the Chair understands it.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONAGHAN) there were—ayes 271 and noes 41.

Mr. MONAGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Montana demands the yeas and nays. Those in favor of taking this vote by the yeas and nays will rise and stand until counted. [After counting.] Thirty-six Members have arisen; not a sufficient number, and the yeas and nays are refused.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on next Tuesday, after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PREVENTION OF SALES DISCRIMINATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8442) making it unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to discriminate in price or terms of sale between purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, to prohibit the payment of brokerage or commission under certain conditions, to suppress pseudo advertising allowances, to provide a presumptive measure of damages in certain cases, and to protect the independent merchant, the public whom he serves, and the manufacturer from whom he buys, from exploitation by unfair competitors.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 8442, with Mr. MEAD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SNELL. How is this bill being read and when will amendments be in order? As I understand it, the bill now consists of one section, the Senate amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the bill comprises one section, and by agreement yesterday the first section of the bill was considered as read, and the second section, the committee amendment, has been read. Amendments will be offered to that section.

Mr. SNELL. Then we will read each section of the Senate bill and consider it as the original bill?

The CHAIRMAN. There is just one section to the House bill, and we have read that section. Amendments to that section are in order.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: On page 6, lines 4 to 17, strike out all of subsection 1.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take any time to discuss this amendment. This is the committee amendment which strikes out the classification subsection of the bill. We discussed it yesterday. Unless there is some opposition to the amendment, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: On page 7, lines 20 to 23, strike out all of subsection 5.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment and is one of the amendments that was discussed yesterday. It merely takes from the bill the basing-point provision. Unless there is some opposition to the amendment I ask for a vote.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the gentleman from Arkansas if it is not a fact that when a request was made for a rule for the consideration of this bill that two gentlemen on the Rules Committee, especially the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. LEWIS], and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARLAN] objected to that provision and we felt that our chances for getting a rule would be jeopardized unless we agreed to take it out. That is one reason we agreed to take it out in addition to others.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would not want it to appear that only these two gentlemen were opposed to that section, for I know many Members had voiced their opposition to the basing-point section in this bill because it is a substantive matter of law which has no place in the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I stated in addition that a large number of members of the committee were opposed to it. Then I stated that that was in addition to other reasons.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LEWIS of Colorado. The gentleman from Texas is absolutely correct in saying that I voiced my objection to the basing-point provision, as did many other Members of the House; but I want it distinctly understood that I made it as an individual Member of the House and not as a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. PATMAN. We understood that.

Mr. MILLER. We understand that.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. I want to congratulate the committee for eliminating this provision from the bill at the request of many of us. If the section had remained in, it would be ruinous to small-town industry located some distance from the market.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Chairman, if this provision remains in the bill, it would result in forcing f. o. b. shipping prices on manufacturers; but with this provision eliminated they will not be forced to charge f. o. b. shipping point prices. Otherwise, many would not be able to compete with foreign manufacturers, for instance, from Canada, who would not be subject to this provision if it remained in the bill.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee I voted to eliminate this paragraph, no. 5. I advocated the elimination of this paragraph in the committee, because I considered it would result in a hardship to the manufacturing industry of this country and of my own State.

LET'S BE FAIR TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT—HE IS PROTECTING INDUSTRY AND LABOR AGAINST ANY UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION

Permit me to state at this time that I am opposed to any action upon the part of Congress that would place a burden upon industry and result in an advantage to foreign manufacturers. Ever since I came here I have endeavored to prevent unfair competition from foreign imports, and in that connection I protested the dumping of Japanese imports into our country. I am pleased to note that only the other day, upon a thorough study and recommendation of the Tariff Commission, the President has ordered that duties upon textile imports be raised. This was done fairly and

equitably to help particularly the textile industry of my region and without malice toward any nation.

I ADVOCATE A FAIR DEAL TO OUR DECENT MANUFACTURERS

I might add that I have advocated that the Government refuse contracts of supplies to any manufacturers who utilized child or convict labor or sweatshop methods, because I want a square deal in Government contracts for our decent manufacturers who are finding it increasingly difficult to bid in competition with chiselers—those who exploit labor, their stockholders, or their creditors.

Now, in some of these matters I have conscientiously differed with some members of the industry. Measures to improve their labor relations have brought opposition, even from some in my own State. Nevertheless, when they are right, I will agree with them, and when they are wrong, I shall not fear to express myself accordingly.

The paragraph in this bill that we are eliminating is as follows:

(5) That the word "price" as used in section 2 shall be construed to mean the amount received by the vendor after deducting freight or other transportation, if any, allowed or defrayed by the vendor.

REASONS AGAINST LIMITING MANUFACTURES TO F. O. B. SHIPPING POINT PRICE IN AMENDING OUR ANTITRUST LAWS

I believe that there are very important reasons why this paragraph should be eliminated entirely, not only for the reason that there is already under consideration a bill which has separately and wholly to do with the basing-point price method, and on which committee hearings have been held, but also for the reason that the basing-point price method has some economically sound merits, and to prohibit the legitimate carrying on of this pricing system by industries will have serious consequences in many industries doing business within the confines of the United States. There is still a further most important reason why this particular definition of price should be eliminated from the instant bill, which is that it would compel all manufacturers and wholesalers under the jurisdiction of the United States Government to ship all their merchandise on an f. o. b. point of origin basis and the consequences of such a statute would be to place many of our manufacturers and wholesalers at a serious disadvantage when competing with foreign manufacturers and exporters who do business in the United States.

But this paragraph involves more than the so-called basing-point system. All this system does is to equalize the freight which the customers of a given manufacturer or wholesaler pay, thereby giving an opportunity to all customers to operate on the same equal basis. There is an economic justification of this system, because it provides an open and above-board method for manufacturers and wholesalers to meet competition outside of their own local freight area. Second, whatever the cost of equalizing freight may be, it is more than offset by the economies of volume production and volume distribution which the greater trading area provides. In other words, the volume production thus obtained lowers the manufacturers' and wholesalers' per-unit cost and enables them to make lower prices to their customers in their own local trading areas.

But a more serious consequence of the inclusion of this definition of price, as previously stated, would be to compel all manufacturers to ship f. o. b. shipping point, and therefore compel the very definite localization of operations of all manufacturers and wholesalers, which would have the immediate effect of increasing costs as the result of seriously limited volume production.

VOLUME PRODUCTION

Volume production is the very lifeblood of many types of industries. If the products they manufacture cannot be made in large volume, upon which the low cost is dependent, the cost of the finished product would be so high that it would seriously curtail, if not entirely prohibit, their consumption.

This paragraph would seriously affect the publishers of national magazines, because it may mean that the national publishers cannot sell their magazines not only for the rea-

son that the freight charges on the magazines to distant points will be so great as to prohibit the sale of the magazines at those points, but also for the reason that the magazines are dependent upon advertising revenues derived from national distributors whose operations will be seriously curtailed by this definition of price.

If this paragraph remains in this bill, it will mean the increased centralization of manufacturing in the more thickly populated industrial centers.

Some people say these consequences can easily be offset by manufacturers and wholesalers establishing wholesale-distributing points all over the United States. However, this would mean increasing the number of operations and the amount of handling, all of which entails increased cost which the consumer must pay, and only the larger manufacturers in the country could finance the cost, and it would mean the further submergence of the small industry and the small-business man, which would actually tend to enhance monopoly in all branches of industry.

I ADVOCATE PROTECTION FOR CONNECTICUT INDUSTRY AGAINST ANY UNFAIR FOREIGN COMPETITION

Another very serious objection to this paragraph is that in many instances our manufacturers and wholesalers would be placed at a serious disadvantage in meeting competition of manufacturers in other countries. Take an instance from my own State—the Scoville Manufacturing Co., a large and old established concern which manufactures thousands of different kinds of metal products, from articles for personal use—such as buttons—to parts to be used in the manufacture of other merchandise. Under the terms of this definition of price in the instant bill, they would be compelled to charge freight from Connecticut to New York City, to Baltimore, to New Orleans, to San Francisco, to Detroit, or to Chicago, just to mention a few major manufacturing centers. A manufacturer in the same kind of business, located in Canada or in Europe, or any other industrial country, and who is not subject to the jurisdiction of our Federal statutes, would be able to deliver his products f. o. b. to every one of these industrial cities which I have mentioned for the reason that they are all direct ports of entry into the United States. By the wording of this definition of price in this paragraph, the Scoville Manufacturing Co. could not meet the foreign competition, nor could any other manufacturer in the United States, under like conditions, meet that competition. The only way open to them would be to set up manufacturing branches in Canada, which would have the effect of further increasing unemployment in the United States.

Because of the reasons that I have given, I also favor the exclusion of this paragraph.

Mr. MILLER. I think the amendment ought to be adopted. I doubt whether that provision ought ever to be in this kind of bill anyway.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the committee's opinion that with this provision eliminated, the bill, if enacted into law, will be as strong and effective in eliminating underhanded concessions and trade practices as it would be with that provision in the bill?

Mr. MILLER. I do not know what the opinion of the committee is on that question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the opinion of the chairman of the committee?

Mr. MILLER. If the gentleman is addressing me, I am very much in favor of leaving the section; but I am offering the amendment at the request of the Committee on the Judiciary. I think the basing-point practice is indefensible and we should deal with it soon in a separate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN: On page 9, paragraph (e), after the word "price", in line 9, insert "or services or facilities furnished"; in line 16, after the word "price", insert "or the furnishing of services or facilities"; in line 18, after the word "competitor", strike out the period and insert "or the services or facilities furnished by a competitor."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment agreed to unanimously by the committee, and was explained yesterday. It simply allows a seller to meet not only competition in price of other competitors but also competition in services and facilities furnished.

Unless there is some objection, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MILLER: On page 9, at the end of the committee amendment, add an additional section, as follows:

"Sec. 2. That nothing herein contained shall affect rights of action arising, or litigation pending, or orders of the Federal Trade Commission issued and in effect or pending on review, based on section 2 of said act of October 15, 1914, prior to the effective date of this amendatory act: *Provided*, That where, prior to the effective date of this amendatory act the Federal Trade Commission has issued an order requiring any person to cease and desist from a violation of section 2 of said act of October 15, 1914, and such order is pending on review or is in effect either as issued or as affirmed or modified by a court of competent jurisdiction, and the Commission shall have reason to believe that such person has committed, used, or carried on, since the effective date of this amendatory act, or is committing, using, or carrying on, any act, practice, or method in violation of any of the provisions of said section 2 as amended by this act, it may reopen such original proceeding and may issue and serve upon such person its complaint, supplementary to the original complaint, stating its charges in that respect. Thereupon the same proceedings shall be had upon such supplementary complaint as provided in section 11 of said act of October 15, 1914. If upon such hearing the Commission shall be of the opinion that any act, practice, or method charged in said supplementary complaint has been committed, used, or carried on since the effective date of this amendatory act, or is being committed, used, or carried on, in violation of said section 2 as amended by this act, it shall make a report in writing in which it shall state its findings as to the facts and shall issue and serve upon such person its order modifying or amending its original order to include any additional violations of law so found. Thereafter the provisions of section 11 of said act of October 15, 1914, as to review and enforcement of orders of the Commission shall in all things apply to such modified or amended order. If upon review as provided in said section 11 the court shall set aside such modified or amended order, the original order shall not be affected thereby, but it shall be and remain in force and effect as fully and to the same extent as if such supplementary proceedings had not been taken."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the amendment that the Clerk has just read proposes to add a new section to the bill at the request of the Federal Trade Commission. It is not offered as a committee amendment. I do not know why the matter was not presented to the committee, but I have a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Commission, signed by Mr. Ayres, Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission.

This amendment accomplishes only one thing. In the Goodyear Tire & Rubber case, recently completed by the Federal Trade Commission, thousands and thousands of pages of testimony were taken and months were spent in trying the case. A cease-and-desist order was entered by the Federal Trade Commission. This record is now on appeal to the circuit court of appeals as provided by law. The amendment which I have just offered provides, in the event this particular bill is passed and should the respondent, the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., refuse to comply with the orders of the Commission, made by virtue of this amendment, the matter could be heard on that record and additional orders made. That is all that the amendment seeks to accomplish.

The request comes, as I say, in the form of a letter from the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission and is offered for the purpose of holding in statu quo the proceedings already had in the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. case.

LXXX—520

Mr. CELLER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. Is there any danger that these provisions could be made retroactive in reference to that particular case?

Mr. MILLER. No; the amendment specifically provides that cannot be done.

Mr. CELLER. If I understand correctly, the trial of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. case has occupied considerable time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. The case has taken years.

Mr. CELLER. I may be wrong or I may be right in what I am about to say, but I am asking for information because I only saw the amendment a short time ago. The amendment might have the effect of permitting the Federal Trade Commission to consolidate the action that is now pending with a future action that might arise out of the acts and doings of this defendant after the effective date of the bill we are now considering, if passed?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. So that in the interest of saving time they might be permitted to unite the actions?

Mr. MILLER. I may say there are several parties that have intervened in this particular case. It would save all of those parties the trouble and cost of taking anew that testimony and going over those proceedings again.

Mr. CELLER. Would it deprive the defendants of any rights?

Mr. MILLER. None whatsoever.

Mr. CELLER. The committee has not been able to consider the amendment at all?

Mr. MILLER. No. I will say very frankly the committee has not been able to consider it prior to this morning.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit as a part of my remarks the letter of the Acting Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission in which he requests that the amendment be adopted, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include this letter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The letter follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, May 1, 1936.

HON. HATTON W. SUMNERS,
Chairman of the Judiciary Committee,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN: I am handing you herewith suggested amendments to H. R. 8442, but which the Commission deems important amendments to whatever bill passes amending section 2 of the Clayton Act.

The principal suggested amendment is to make sure that any amendment of section 2 will not impair orders heretofore issued by the Commission under that section, notable among which is the recent order against the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. We deem it important not only that these existent orders be not affected by amendments to section 2, but also that provision be made whereby full competitive conditions may be restored or brought about by virtue of the amendments to section 2 by reopening the old case and thus avoid re-proof of facts that may be common to both the original and supplementary proceedings. Hence the proviso.

The other amendment is the usual provision covering possible partial invalidity of the provisions of the bill.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. AYRES, Acting Chairman.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am not necessarily opposed to this amendment; however, it is offered at the eleventh hour. Certainly it is unfortunate that the members of the committee were not able to give it due reflection. It is a rather long amendment, having taken about 5 minutes to read. It certainly is ill advised at this stage to ask the Members of the House to pass upon an amendment of this character. To be frank, I do not know anything about it. I do not know whether it should be opposed or agreed to. I have great faith and confidence in what the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas has stated with reference to the

amendment, but even he has had very little time for reflection on the amendment, and it seems rather ill-advised to act on it at this juncture.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. In just a moment.

However, inasmuch as the bills will have to be considered in conference, the Senate bill being different from the House bill, I hope the conferees who will be appointed will give sufficient time and reflection to this matter so that they can come to a proper conclusion thereon.

I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I wanted to suggest what the gentleman has already brought out after I asked him to yield. The bill will go to conference and all the differences will be ironed out. If it is discovered that this is a bad amendment, I am sure the conferees will agree to strike it out, although I do not think it is a bad amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PALMISANO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have always supported legislation for the benefit of the little man. I supported the Kelly-Capper fair-trade bill, which bill had for its purpose to correct the evils complained of by the small merchants. I intend to vote for this bill, but, however, I am fearful that this bill will not accomplish the results claimed by its proponents, as I am satisfied the little merchants cannot compete with the chain stores in purchasing in bulk, and for another reason the chain store will organize its forces to deal within State lines, in which case the law will not apply.

I have always maintained the proper way to compete with the chain store is for the various States to pass laws defining each and every business and have a license for each business and not permit anyone to have more than three licenses for any one place of business, and to provide a double license fee for the second license and a triple fee for the third license. In that way you will not have department stores and chain drug stores selling everything from a toothpick to an automobile. If the men who are interested in this legislation will consider legislation as I propose, I feel that they will accomplish the purpose they are seeking, but I am afraid that they will not accomplish it under this present bill.

I may say further, considering the amendments which the committee has offered on the floor of the House, this brings back to my mind the time when we considered the Kelly-Capper bill in the House. The Kelly-Capper bill consisted of about three pages, and when it was considered in the House there were about a thousand amendments offered. It seems to me the committee itself is uncertain about its ground after considering it for hours and days and months, and now they come on the floor of the House and offer committee amendments that have never been considered in the committee. While I have gone along with the committee, I feel that this legislation will not accomplish the purpose they are seeking to bring about.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. I presume the gentleman refers to the Kelly-Capper bill when he speaks of the Kelly bill?

Mr. PALMISANO. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. And the gentleman would be in favor of the principle underlying the Kelly-Capper bill?

Mr. PALMISANO. I am in favor of the principle of the Kelly-Capper bill and I am in sympathy with the purpose of this bill, but I say that under this bill and under the provisions of the amendment you will not accomplish the purpose you are seeking.

Mr. CELLER. I agree with the gentleman, and I am going to ask the gentleman this question. The gentleman from Massachusetts is going to offer an amendment embodying the Borah-Van Nuys provisions or the provisions of the Kelly-Capper bill, and I hope the gentleman will vote for that amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been very considerable lobbying going on for and against this proposed legislation. I presume every Member has had terrible pressure from back home, just as I have had, to commit himself to this legislation. I have declined to do this and have stated, frankly, to my constituents that my vote on the matter would depend upon the final form of the legislation and that is the way I feel about it now.

I am in sympathy, however, with the problems which are sought to be met by this legislation. I think, unquestionably, there has been grave discrimination against individual merchants and business establishments on the part of manufacturers who have been coerced in many cases into doing this because of the buying power of large financial organizations.

I want to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to tell me whether or not in the investigation of this matter it developed or information was furnished with respect to what became of these secret rebates and dummy brokerages that his committee found were being paid. Did they go to the consumer or were they put in the pockets of the person or firm who got them?

Mr. PATMAN. The money was put in the pockets of the special few who were getting these rebates, and I will state to the gentleman that a "coop" has a wonderful opportunity for its manager not to pass all these benefits on to their members, and some of them I think are opposed to this bill because it will bring it all out in the open and they will not be able to get by with that.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Then if we take away these dummy brokerages and these advertising allowances, which are pure fictions, instead of increasing the cost to the consumer, it will simply reduce the profit being wrongfully taken by these special-privileged people.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is exactly right. They will be passed on to the public.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is what I had gathered, and I may also say that I am very pleased the committee has taken out subparagraph 5. I certainly could not have supported the legislation with that provision in it. While I may be wrong in my construction of it, my viewpoint is if that had been left in the bill it would have been ruinous to many manufacturers throughout the country.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CELLER. I understand the gentleman from Texas, in his inquiry, investigated what is known as the Retail Federation, and it may be that some of the members of that organization may have pocketed these rebates, but this bill refers to all manufacturers, all manner and kind of dealers, all cooperatives and all chain stores, department stores, and mail-order houses, and it does not follow that the rebates that they may have received went into the pockets of all the owners of all of these enterprises. They passed them on to the consumer. All the economists I have come in contact with indicate that this bill indubitably will have the effect of raising prices to the consumer, because these entities could not buy more cheaply because of this bill's restrictions.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I cannot yield further to the gentleman.

I do not agree with the gentleman's construction as to what happened. I think most of the secret rebates and dummy brokerages that have been paid went into the treasury of the corporation that got them and at least the greater part of them were never passed on to the consumer.

I hope this bill will be so perfected by amendments that we can all support it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute amendment to the committee amendment offered by Mr. HEALEY: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1924, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, to be a party to, or assist in, any transaction of sale, or contract to sell, which discriminates to his knowledge against competitors of the purchaser, in that any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge is granted to the purchaser over and above any discount, rebate, allowance, or advertising service charge available at the time of such transaction to said competitors in respect of a sale of goods of like grade, quality, and quantity; to sell, or contract to sell, goods in any part of the United States at prices lower than those exacted by said person elsewhere in the United States for the purpose of destroying competition, or eliminating a competitor in such part of the United States; or to sell, or contract to sell, goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or eliminating a competitor.

"Nothing in this section shall prevent a cooperative association from returning to producers or consumers, or a cooperative wholesale association from returning to its constituent retail members, the whole, or any part of, the net surplus resulting from its trading operations in proportion to purchases from, or sales to, the association.

"Any person violating any of the provisions of this section shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both."

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Is this amendment offered as an amendment to the committee amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. It is offered as a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, this amendment which I have offered as a substitute for the committee amendment is the so-called Borah-Van Nuys bill. The purpose of any legislation along the lines of the bill we are discussing, as I understand it, is to eliminate certain discriminatory practices which are being utilized by certain large chain organizations to the detriment of the small independent retailers.

In the hearings before the committee it developed that the chain stores were resorting to certain practices which gave them a decided advantage over the ordinary buyers, and it was shown that the principal practices they are relying on to obtain that advantage are so-called fictitious brokerage allowances, advertising discounts, and certain other unfair and unwarranted rebates, discounts, and allowances.

Some of these chain organizations maintain their own brokerage agencies. Through that medium they obtain a discriminatory advantage on their purchases denied to other buyers, large or small. Mr. Chairman, I am in full accord with legislation which seeks to eliminate these unequal and unfair advantages.

In my judgment, the Borah-Van Nuys bill in specific terms and direct and effective language prohibits price discriminations through these methods. It states specifically the acts and practices which are prohibited and provides a heavy penalty for violation. Its language is clear, concise, and understandable.

The Borah-Van Nuys bill is the only bill that has been offered on this subject, in my judgment, that does not directly or indirectly fix prices. It therefore more nearly conforms to the spirit of the Clayton Antitrust Act than many of the provisions of the bill under discussion. Because of its non-price-fixing features it is, in my opinion, a bill which will best safeguard the interests of the consumer, and we men who represent the large consuming districts must have regard for the consumer and be watchful of his interests. If as a result of more efficient methods in merchandizing savings can be made in the price of commodities to the ultimate consumer, we cannot penalize that efficiency to such an extent that it will affect him adversely.

The language in this bill, which I am offering as a substitute amendment, eliminates all of the advantages that the chain stores have been getting in the past. It effectually

destroys these unfair practices and methods and defeats attempts to stifle or destroy competition.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEALEY. Briefly.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I wish the gentleman would point out the difference between his substitute and the bill we have before us.

Mr. HEALEY. I am sorry, but the time remaining to me will not permit me to adequately discuss the difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us first dispose of the point of order reserved by the gentleman from Wisconsin. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard upon the point of order?

Mr. BOILEAU. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the amendment pending before the House at the present time for the reason that the bill itself and the committee amendment deal only with the regulation of the activities of the seller. It is confined entirely to the operations of the seller in commerce. The amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts attempts to regulate both the seller and the buyer. For that reason I am of opinion that the amendment which regulates both the buyer and the seller is not germane to a bill that deals only with the seller; and for the further reason that the amendment to the amendment contains a penalty, provides a penalty for violation of its provisions, while the bill under consideration and the committee amendment carry no penalty in the form of fines and imprisonment. The amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts attempts to regulate both the buyer and the seller and provides penalties. For that reason I maintain that the amendment is not germane to the committee amendment.

Mr. CELLER. Does the Chair wish to hear further argument on the germaneness of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule; but the Chair will hear the gentleman from New York briefly.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the provision in the Borah-Van Nuys bill, the present amendment, does not seek to regulate the buyer; it seeks to regulate the seller, just exactly as is the case with the pending bill. To illustrate, the pending bill does not operate against the buyer in the way of penalties; it does not place restrictions on the buyer. It places restrictions only on the seller, just as the Borah-Van Nuys bill does in that sense. Both the pending amendment and the bill refer to price discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts involves, in the judgment of the Chair, the subject of price discrimination. In line 9 of page 5 of the pending bill we read in section 2:

where such commodities are sold for use, consumption, or resale within the United States—

And so forth. It is therefore a problem of price discrimination. The amendment, in the judgment of the Chair, effectuates the same purpose as the purpose contained in the bill, attempts to modify the same legislation. It deals with the same general subject, and, in the judgment of the Chair, the amendment is in order. Therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

BORAH-VAN NUYS AMENDMENT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. If this amendment is adopted, the bill is dead. In order to get the bill through, the Senate permitted this amendment to go in. If you adopt it now and the bill becomes a law, the bill will be unworkable; it will not mean anything in the world. Let me tell you about this Borah-Van Nuys amendment. Evidently it was very hastily drawn.

It applies only where the quantities are equal. It will not prohibit pseudo-brokerage or pseudo-advertising allowances or anything else, except where the quantities are exactly the same. They could change it by just taking one case out of a carload or putting one case more in the carload, and this would not apply.

Furthermore, it is worded in a way that the independents would have to show that this large corporate chain was doing it for the purpose of destroying him as a competitor. That means that the little independent would have to employ a staff of snoopers or clairvoyants or somebody to go out and get this evidence for him. He would have to go all over the Nation in order to do it. It would be absolutely impossible. You may just as well have no bill at all if you adopt this amendment. Furthermore, it provides that the competitors shall not sell at an unreasonably low price. Not only is that very indefinite as to what is an unreasonably low price but, in addition to that, it will also have to be shown that it was sold at an unreasonably low price for the purpose of destroying a competitor. If you really want a bill, if you want the Clayton Act amended so as to take out the weasel phrases that caused its destruction in 1914, if you want to really put teeth into the act in such a way that independent merchants will be protected and the consumers, the farmers, the wage earners would have a square deal, do not vote for this amendment. That would mean absolutely destroying the bill. If there is any doubt in your mind about that, I ask you to at least vote against it, and then when the bill goes to conference the question will be before the conferees, and if they still want to put it in, or any part of it, they can do it; but if you adopt this amendment, that question will not be in conference; it will be ended so far as the House and the Senate are concerned. So I plead with you, do not destroy this bill with all kinds of amendments, some of which sound very good, until you analyze them. This is one of them that sounds really good, but when you analyze the amendment you find that it is so artfully worded and contains such clever phrases that when you get through with such an amendment as this you have not got any law at all. What is the use of a penalty if there is no law? They make the argument that there is a penalty to it. If you have no law to enforce, why have a penalty? You certainly would have no law under this amendment. I would rather have the present Clayton Act. As ineffective and unenforceable as it is, I would rather have it than to have this provision written into the law.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHRISTIANSON. Do we understand that the bill as passed by the Senate embodies this same Borah-Van Nuys amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. It does. Senator ROBINSON agreed to it, stating that he was opposed to it, but he was willing to have it go to conference. But if we agree to it here, it will not go to conference. I therefore ask you to vote down this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

I must again differ with our colleague from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. The Senate did not ill consider this so-called Borah-Van Nuys provision. They conducted lengthy and careful hearings thereupon. As a matter of fact, they held no hearings on the Robinson bill itself. I took the trouble to analyze the witnesses who appeared in these hearings in favor of the Borah-Van Nuys amendment. There were 21 witnesses coming from all over the country. Of those 21, every one of them approved of the principles underlying the Borah-Van Nuys bill, and condemned unanimously the so-called Robinson bill, which is very similar to the Patman bill. There was one marketing specialist; there were two economists, three representing huge housewives' and consumers' organizations; four retailers; five representing large farmer organizations, six representing manufacturers, and seven representing wholesalers.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Briefly.

Mr. CONNERY. Will the gentleman explain to us in a few words the difference between the Borah-Van Nuys amendment and this amendment?

Mr. CELLER. I will be very happy to come to it. This Borah-Van Nuys proposition is heartily in accord with the wishes of the Manufacturers' Association, with the farmer cooperatives, the National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and all the other great farm organizations.

All the dairy interests are in favor of this Borah-Van Nuys proposition. Why? Because it very justly and properly, in simple language rather than language involved and difficult to comprehend as in the instant bill, provides this: If you set a price you must make that price available to all customers under like conditions. You cannot discriminate, under the Borah-Van Nuys proposition, in the matter of discounts, in the matter of advertising, in the matter of rebates. You must treat everybody alike. Offer to treat them all alike and there is no difficulty. You would not be compelled to go down to the Federal Trade Commission and defend yourself and prove, step by step, by exhibition of your books your differences, if any, in cost, and show all this at great difficulty and expense. The Borah-Van Nuys bill contains no severe and dangerous limitation upon quantity discounts.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. In just a minute. However, when you have to meet competition in a given locality, and the selling price is lower than yours, you have a right to go into that locality and meet that proposition—lower your price. Now, let us see how it would affect the dairy interests. Let us take, for instance, the vicinity of Chicago or New York. There are dairymen doing an intrastate business. In sections of Indiana and Illinois you have dairymen doing an intrastate business within the State. They give a price for milk. If the large dairy interests in and around those States have a price which is greater than the local price, they are out of business unless they can meet the lower price. If, for example, the Dairymen's League in New York cannot meet competition in New York City from local dealers, they might as well fold up and go out of business. The Borah-Van Nuys bill says you can meet the price of a competitor, but this bill says you cannot do so. It is unlawful and involves severe penalties if you do it. You cannot so lower your price or affect your conditions as to put a man out of business, so as to crush a competitor or to reduce or lessen competition. That you cannot do and should not do. It is illegal for you to do so and severe penalties are proscribed. But everybody is treated alike under the Borah-Van Nuys proposition. For that reason I commend it heartily to you.

The very last provision of the Borah-Van Nuys proposition offered by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] provides it shall be unlawful to sell or contract to sell goods at unreasonably low prices for the purpose of destroying competition or of eliminating a competitor.

It must be remembered that the Borah-Van Nuys provision does not run afoul of the desires of the farmers, the consumers, the mining interests, the manufacturers, the dairy interests, the labor interests, and the cooperatives. It does not subsidize the middleman, and any economies that could be saved in purchasing would be saved to the purchaser and inevitably passed on to the consumer.

Its language is judicial in its nature and does not put business into a legislative strait jacket. Under it one could sell at different prices in different sections of the country to meet competition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. The testimony was to the effect that that would have the exact effect as though we had passed the

Kelly-Capper bill with reference to loss leaders. The bane of existence of the retail druggists and the retail grocers in their competition with the large chains, is the extravagant and unwarranted use of so-called loss leaders—selling below cost, advertised, trade-marked, or copyrighted articles that are the subject of great advertisement and radio programs. Many witnesses testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee to the effect that this provision would do away, to an appreciable degree, with this wide-spread extravagant use of loss leaders. I believe one of the reasons that actuated the original sponsor of this bill was the practice of loss leaders. Here is an opportunity to do something against, to strike at these loss leaders. Let us avail ourselves of this opportunity. I am opposed to these loss leaders.

Here is an instrumentality to enable a retail grocer and retail druggist to get on all the better in their competition against these large mass buyers about whose iniquities we have heard so much—much, however, of which was fiction and little of which was fact.

The Borah-Van Nuys provision upholds the principle that competition should be free, provided it be just. It is a short and easily understood provision. It states specifically the acts prohibited, the actions interdicted. It not only provides a definite and powerful element of restraint but it also wisely leaves an alleged violation open to be decided entirely on its merits. Any law which goes further than that must actually operate in restraint of trade. The instant bill actually does operate in restraint of trade unless it be very drastically amended.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. CONNERY. Does the gentleman mean by loss leader some popularly advertised article, advertised over the radio and through the magazines, which the chain stores will sell below cost?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; or the department stores, like Macy's in my section or Filene's in the gentleman's section. They undersell these advertised brands in the hope of inducing customers into their establishments, losing on those articles, but making up the difference on staple articles.

If you want to do something for those who are supposed to be benefited by the Robinson-Patman bill, vote to sustain the Borah-Van Nuys amendment.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro-forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY], who served with me as a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill, and for whom I have the highest regard, and who, I am sure, is sincere in what he says on the floor regarding the amendment that he has proposed, has stated, I call to the attention of the Members of the House, that the purpose he desires to accomplish by the amendment is the doing away with and the striking out of the three discounts which now cause the inequality between large and small purchasers in the price they pay for their goods. In other words, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] states that the purpose of the amendment he proposes is identical with the purpose of the amendment the committee has proposed in this bill. Without going into detail as to the proposed amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts, I may say that I am a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the subcommittee which considered this measure. We held lengthy hearings, and we held conferences following the hearings and discussed this legislation at great length. We considered the wording of this bill in order that we might accomplish the very things the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HEALEY] states he desires to accomplish—namely, the elimination of fake brokerage discounts, dishonest discounts under the guise of advertising discounts, which are in fact fake advertising discounts, and quantity discounts which enable the large purchaser to secure an unconscionable advantage over the small purchaser. In working out the provisions of this bill in the form in which it is submitted to

the House the members of the Committee on the Judiciary feel, after long consideration and determination, that the bill they presented accomplishes these purposes. Another bill now comes before us in the form of an amendment which, in the opinion of those members of the committee who worked on the bill, will not accomplish the purpose which the committee bill will accomplish. In the Senate bill the word "quantity" is used; so the discrimination must be a discrimination in the exact quantity. In other words, if a seller should take one case out of a shipment he would be excluded from the provisions of this bill. This does not obtain in the bill proposed by the House committee and as it comes to the House.

I have the highest regard for my very good friend, the gentleman from New York, and although he is from New York I think he speaks for the farmers in the language they use in New York in speaking for farmers, but when he states this will do away with the right to meet competition, that is not so.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. With all due respect to my good friend from New York, the fact is that the bill before us, on page 9, lines 14 to 18, makes specific provision for the meeting of competition by a seller in the event he is confronted with the situation in which a competitor offers his goods at a lower price. I read the portion to which I refer:

That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing that his lower price to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

If we amend this bill to allow a wholesaler not only to meet the low price of a competitor but to go below that price and discriminate below that price, I submit to this body that the whole purpose of this legislation has been destroyed. Such a provision would render this bill completely and totally ineffective. I sincerely trust, therefore, those who are in favor of this measure will vote down this amendment and support the committee in the work it has done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], who in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary but on his behalf and under the direction of the committee is handling the bill.

All Members of the House a day or two ago received a lengthy communication signed by leaders of various farm organizations. They made five objections to the bill. The first objection was directed against the provision of the bill relating to the basing point. The second objection related to classification of wholesalers, and so forth. Today the Committee of the Whole has accepted two committee amendments which struck out these two particular paragraphs; so these first two objections of the farm leaders have been met by the action of the Committee of the Whole in adopting these amendments.

Two of the other objections made by them are not, in my opinion, valid.

In my judgment, these two objections are not sound, because the language of the bill is very clear and does not justify their interpretation. However, in the opinion of these gentlemen with whom we have conferred, the language is not clear.

Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of clarifying the congressional intent, I have taken this time to get the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas as to his understanding of the meaning of the language at the beginning

of section 2 (a), page 5, of the bill. The section starts out as follows:

SEC. 2. (a) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality—

And so forth. My understanding of that language is that the sellers may not discriminate, but they may, nevertheless, charge different prices in different communities to persons who are not competitors. In other words, as I understand it—and I ask the gentleman whether or not this is his opinion—a seller may sell a commodity in one community at one price and sell it in another community at a different price, because those two purchasers, even though they are purchasers for resale, are not competitors, and therefore there is no discrimination in price. Is that the understanding of the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER]?

Mr. MILLER. They are operating in different markets. I do not think there is any doubt about the language.

Mr. BOILEAU. I am asking these questions at the request of certain farm organizations, and I want to show the congressional intent.

Mr. MILLER. As indicated by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. UTTERBACK], the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and some others were appointed as a special subcommittee to work on this bill. That was our understanding. We undertook to draft a bill that would deal with the three principal things with which we are all familiar. It was not our intention to injure the organizations about which the gentleman is speaking. The gentleman has the right interpretation of the bill.

Mr. BOILEAU. In this particular letter, which refers to this particular section, I quote as follows:

We are fearful that this section, viewed in the light of the committee report, might be construed to mean that different prices could not be charged by the same seller in different markets.

Is it the gentleman's opinion that their fears in this respect are without foundation?

Mr. MILLER. They are entirely unfounded.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, the farm organizations have one further objection that needs clarification along the same line, and that is with reference to advertising allowances. They refer to sections 5 (c) and (d) insofar as these particular paragraphs affect advertising allowances.

In their communication they state as follows:

We are unwilling to have our operations put in a strait jacket under legislation which might require that if an advertising campaign is put on in Washington, D. C., a similar program must be followed in each market in the United States in which our cooperatives operate.

In other words, it is my understanding that under the language of the bill having to do with advertising allowances, paragraphs 5 (c) and (d), particularly (d), a manufacturer or other seller may give advertising allowances to stimulate trade in one community, but because he gives such advertising allowances in one community he is not required to give an identical, a similar, or a proportional advertising allowance to a customer in another community who is not in competition with the persons in the community in which the advertising allowances are granted.

Mr. MILLER. The gentleman is correct, and I call attention to the specific provision of the act, which appears in lines 3 to 6, inclusive, page 9, reading as follows:

(d) By such person, unless such payment or consideration is available on proportionally equal terms to all other customers competing in the distribution of such products or commodities.

Competing in the distribution on that market, in that community, and in that place.

Mr. BOILEAU. May I apologize to the House for having taken this time, but because of the fact a large group of people had what I considered an erroneous impression as to the provisions of this bill I wanted to use this time in order to clarify the congressional intent. With the permission of the gentleman from Arkansas, and without in any way reflecting upon his leadership in this matter, may I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], author of the bill, whether that is also his understanding of the provisions of the pending bill?

Mr. PATMAN. That is my understanding and I am thoroughly familiar with what the gentleman is talking about. I conferred with farm leaders, and I understand the situation just as the gentleman from Wisconsin has explained it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, the matter has been clarified to my satisfaction, and I therefore yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 9, line 24, after the word "association", add a new paragraph, as follows:

"(g) Nothing in this section shall apply to any farmer or livestock producer in reference to agricultural or livestock products sold by such farmer or producer prior to the first processing thereof."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in a helpful spirit only. I appreciate very much the fine work which these gentlemen have done, and I do not want to interfere in any way with the orderly working out of the bill as they have fashioned it. I expect to support the bill. However, it is their understanding that the individual farmer and livestock producer of raw products are not included; therefore this cannot in any way injure the measure.

I rarely offer amendments, and I regret exceedingly that I must do so in this instance. If you will look at certain features in the first part of the bill, it will be found it is unlawful for any person engaged in commerce or in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of like grade and quality where it may substantially lessen competition, and this applies to either sellers or buyers.

I submit to the thinking Members of the House that the individual farmer and livestock man stands on a little different basis from other businesses. Up to this time he has had very little to say about the price of his products. We are trying to work it around more and more so that we may approach the time when he will have the same voice as others have, and to illustrate the dangers that may arise, I live in what is known as the panhandle of Texas. The livestock, cattle, sheep, and hogs are practically all shipped in interstate commerce. We sell a great many of them at Kansas City. They are shipped to Kansas City. They are sometimes sold in competition in the yards. They are sometimes sold to buyers who come there and look at the cattle and purchase them before they go to the yards. They are sometimes purchased even before they are unloaded. They are in interstate commerce. For instance, a producer ships two cars of white-faced Hereford cattle to market. A feeder from Iowa bids 10.20 for one car. He can only get 9.50 bid on the car. What is he to do? Must he refuse to sell them and feed them stockyards hay at \$1 per bale? The same thing applies to apples, as I understand from those who live in apple sections.

I cannot see how it would hurt the operations of this bill to say that on these unprocessed raw commodities there shall be no application of the terms of this bill.

There is involved this danger. If you will turn to subdivision (e) you will find that where a different price is charged, the burden of proof falls upon the person who charges a different price to establish the fact that he has not violated the law. A great many farmers and livestock men live near the borders of the different States and a

great many of these commodities go into interstate commerce. Commerce as used here, and as used in the definitions given by the leading authorities, is a very broad term.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to call the gentleman's attention not only to the fact that the burden of proof will be on the farmer, but under this bill, if his sale is, in effect, a discrimination, whether he realizes it or not, he becomes subject to a penalty, and if judgment is had in the Federal court, triple damages apply.

Mr. JONES. I have not had an opportunity to study the bill fully, and I thank the gentleman for his comment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it was just such amendments as this that led to the entire destruction of the Clayton Act in 1914. They commenced to put this plausible amendment in and that plausible amendment in, and by the time the Clayton Act was passed all the teeth were taken out and it was not enforceable.

We are trying to make the act enforceable. This sounds like a plausible amendment, but do you think the farmers are going to discriminate against anybody? Do you think there is a farmer in this country who is big enough so that he is going to take advantage of somebody through advertising allowances and dummy brokerages and quantity discounts? There is not one in this Nation who is large enough for that, and although there are some large and important livestock producers in the gentleman's district, there is not one so large that he can take advantage of Swift and Armour and the big packers in the markets of Kansas City.

The argument of the gentleman from Texas sounds plausible, but this bill is not to affect cases like that. It only applies to discriminations. It is enforcing honesty, and honesty should apply to the farmers and stock raisers, I will say to my dear friend from Texas, just the same as it applies to the businessman. I am not willing to exempt the farmers from a provision requiring common honesty, and that is all we are doing here, and if they are violating the rule of common honesty, they should suffer the penalty just the same as anyone else.

Now, with regard to the matter of burden of proof, that is an argument that sounds very plausible. Just such arguments as that have destroyed every antitrust law that has ever been presented to the American Congress.

Let me analyze that for you. What does that mean? It means exactly the rule of law today. It is a restatement of existing law. So far as I am concerned you can strike it out. It makes no difference. It is the law of this land exactly as it is written there. If the gentleman were to have a farmer or a livestock grower so large that he would discriminate, become dishonest, treat his customers unfairly, and there should be a charge or complaint filed against him before the Federal Trade Commission, what would he have to do? They would write him a letter and send him a copy of the charges, and under this bill he would rebut that by a statement of the actual facts, and that is all there is to it. If he is not dishonest, if he has not treated his customers unfairly, there will be nothing else in the world to it.

I hope you will not start amending this bill. The Judiciary Committee has worked on the bill for months and months. The subcommittee spent nights and days and Sundays and all the time in the world that a committee could give to legislation the committee gave to this bill. Now, if you start here with amendments that are hastily drawn and quickly considered, you are just as likely to have a law that will not be worth the paper it is written on like the present Clayton Act. Therefore I plead with you not to amend this bill; leave it like it is. It is a good bill.

We have considered what the gentleman from Texas has said. The committee has considered that matter. We are just as much interested in the welfare of the farmer and the stock grower and the others involved as is the gentleman.

We yield to no man on questions of that kind and I hope the gentleman will withdraw the amendment. I think the gentleman should withdraw it in order that not one stone may be thrown in the way of passing this legislation that is very much needed, and needed now. For what? To save the business of the independent merchants of this country who are rapidly becoming victims no. 1, and to save the wage earners who will be forced to pauper wages if something is not done.

The farmers are forced to sell at a price that causes them to do without the comforts and necessities of life. The farmers and the wage earners are victim no. 2. Whenever a monopoly is created there will be another victim, and that will be the consumer. He will be victim no. 3. He will be a victim because the monopoly will pay the producer whatever they want to pay and they will charge the consumer the price they want to charge in order to make up the high bonuses they pay their officers. So I ask you to defeat this amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is not the first plea we have heard at this session or past sessions to the effect, "Do not adopt this amendment. Let it go to the Senate, and if we are wrong the Senate or the conferees will take care of us." I think it is high time for the House to do its own thinking and its own legislating and to put its own bills in proper shape before they leave us.

My distinguished friend from Texas on more than one occasion in discussing the bill says that it is a question of common honesty. Nobody wants to take issue with him on a question of common honesty, because we all want to be honest. Our constituents want to be honest, but you cannot dispose of a proposition like this on the ground that it provides for common honesty.

Take the question of hazards that the farmer has to contend with, not only in selling but in producing. First is the hazard of the elements, next is the hazard of depreciation, especially with reference to fruits and vegetables. There is the hazard of the fluctuating and changing market. I have known the market for apples to fluctuate as much as 100 percent in 60 days.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman know that there is nothing in the bill that will hinder a man changing his price every day and every hour if his purpose is not to discriminate against a competitor?

Mr. ROBERTSON. On page 5 of the bill you provide that if he makes a different price the effect of which is a discrimination—and he may not intend any discrimination—it comes under the terms of the bill.

I know of a producer who can produce one-half million bushels of apples and who could flood the market in any city in the country. That man has had the hazard of the drought, the hazard of the wind and the frost; he has produced perishable fruit, and he faces a fluctuating market. He sells 10,000 bushels one day at, say, \$1 a bushel. He gets from his agent in Liverpool a cable that the British market is flooded, or that the British Government is contemplating a new tariff. He faces a declining market. He must cut his crop loose. He has sold, say, to one Cincinnati dealer 10,000 bushels of apples, and that is all that dealer can handle. He knows of another dealer in Cincinnati who can handle 100,000 bushels of apples. He quotes him a price at 25 cents less a bushel on the same day he has sold the other, because he has had this word of a falling market. Under the terms of this bill the other dealer could take him into the Federal court at Cincinnati, and the first man would charge that he had discriminated against him, that the man to whom he sold the second consignment of apples was putting his apples on the market at 25 cents a bushel less. The first man would claim that he had been hurt financially and that he would sue the apple grower, and in the event of a recovery, the court then, as has been brought out, would grant triple damages. I have prepared an amendment, taken from the fruit and fresh vegetable code, which reads "To

avoid the hazards of depreciation of value of the product through decline of markets." This bill, as my friend knows, started as a wholesaler's code.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about that. This has no reference to the N. R. A. code. It is an amendment to an existing law to take out the weasel phrases that have made the law unenforceable.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CELLER. The bill was written by Mr. Teegarden originally, and he is the attorney for the United States Wholesale Grocers Association, and was their attorney at the time that the N. R. A. was declared unconstitutional.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Anyway, I prepared this amendment, taken from the fresh fruit and vegetable code. They recognized in making their code that they were dealing with a perishable article in a fluctuating market, and they put in there that they could change the code prices to avoid the hazard of depreciation of value of a product through a declining market. If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is adopted, he has taken care of that situation, and I think that is the proper thing to do. I say to my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] that we are stepping out on dangerous ground when we tell the farmers who produce from the soil that they cannot make a difference in price to protect themselves in a falling market. You are stepping on dangerous ground when you say to them, "You will be subject to prosecution; you will be subject to being haled clear across the country, where your product went, into a Federal court." Oh, gentlemen say that reputable lawyers would not accuse one of discrimination in such cases, but that is not the question. Someone may claim discrimination and he could mulct you for the nuisance damages. I am in sympathy with the retail merchants. I want to help them in every way we can, but certainly in trying to help one group we should not risk an unnecessary and unfair burden being placed on another. [Applause.]

Mr. DARDEN. Are not the gentleman's remarks equally applicable to potatoes, vegetables, and so forth?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Certainly; vegetables, potatoes, any perishable crop of that kind which you have to handle in a falling market. The farmer should have an inalienable right to adjust his prices in his own judgment, not in the judgment of the Federal Trade Commission or in the judgment of any other Federal agency, but in his own judgment, if his market is going to fall and he is handling a perishable product.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Going directly to a practical illustration of what the gentleman has just brought out, in view of the fact that there is a tremendous amount of fruit raised in my State, suppose your apple grower in your district gets a cable from Liverpool that something has happened over there to his distributing machine, and that is what it is.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And he then comes along and offers to the A. & P. Co., doing business in my State, 100,000 bushels of apples at 25 cents, or 50 cents a bushel under the market, what happens to the farmer in my State who is trying to get something out of his fruit crop? Is not that just as damaging?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Absolutely not; because the gentleman's farmer has the same right to figure markets as mine.

It is a free competitive marketing system. We should not ever completely abandon it.

Mr. CRAWFORD. But mine is a little grower with 5 or 10 or 15 acres.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Whenever you tell the farmer that the Government is to regulate the price of his product, you have left our fundamental principles, and even in this emergency we must stick to the free competitive system of doing business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. I do not think there is any reason for the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES]. I want to call your attention to the theory of this bill. What are we trying to do in this bill? I call your attention to the first section on page 5. I want to say further to you that the farmer selling livestock, or corn, or cotton, or anything else cannot possibly come under this act unless he is creating a monopoly, and if he is creating a monopoly, a monopoly created by a farmer is just as bad as a monopoly created by a manufacturer.

Let me call your attention to this language:

It shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality, where either or any of the purchases involved in such discrimination are in commerce, where such commodities are sold for use—

Under certain conditions—

and where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy, or prevent competition with any person who either grants or receives the benefit of such discrimination.

Then I call your attention to something else. This bill does this, and this only: It prevents quantity discounts, it prevents advertising allowances, it does away with fraudulent brokerage allowances, and that is all it does do. That is the theory of this bill. Of course, you can go out and dig up all kinds of scarecrows. You can set up all kinds of straw men and knock them down if you want to. You can bring in the farmer, you can bring in every class, but, after all, the question is this, whether or not we are going to let the monopolistic tendencies of the last 20 years continue.

I have no pride of authorship in this bill, although we worked very hard on it. They talk about apples and perishable goods. Let me call your attention to page 7, paragraph 3. It says:

That nothing herein contained shall prevent price changes from time to time where in response to changing conditions affecting the market for or the marketability of the goods concerned—

That takes care of the livestock people. It takes care of the things that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES] is attempting to cure.

Then it says further—

such as but not limited to actual or imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales under court process.

Now, that is the situation that is confronting us here. I come from a rural district. If I ever return to the House it will be by the votes of the farmers. The largest town in my district is 6,000. Farmers are opposed to monopolies, and you cannot prevent monopolies if you pass an act like the old Clayton Act and shoot it full of provisos and amendments and loopholes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the interpretation of any member of this committee is just as important as the interpretation of the language given by a member of the Judiciary Committee. The interpretation placed upon the

language of section 2 (a) on page 5 with reference to the granting of a different price to a different customer in a different locality by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] I say is erroneous. The interpretation placed upon that language by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] and by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] is erroneous. They all agree.

This language reads:

That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce, in the course of such commerce, either directly or indirectly, to discriminate in price between different purchasers of commodities of like grade and quality.

If that means anything, it means that you cannot discriminate—

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. The gentleman is not discussing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will please proceed in order.

Mr. CELLER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is not in order. I am. I say that you cannot make, under the bill, a different price for the same goods of the same quality in a different locality. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] says there is a provision further down in the clause "where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly"; but whenever I charge a lower price to a different customer I have the effect of lowering competition, so I run afoul of the statute immediately. You cannot make a different price among your customers. That is the fly in the ointment.

Let us see what Mr. PATMAN said in the RECORD on yesterday, page 8111. He spoke of "the right of the manufacturer to have a different price for a different quantity, where there is a difference in the cost of manufacture. There is nothing in this bill to prohibit it, but the bill expressly provides that he may have a different price where there is a difference in the cost of manufacture." What will happen if there is no difference in the cost of manufacture, and the goods cost the same that I am selling to my customer. If what Mr. PATMAN says now is true, why did he not say so yesterday? Why did he not say so in all his speeches throughout the country? He has said at all times that the same goods of the same quantity must be always the same in all parts of the country; there can be no variation. As quoted from his speech of yesterday, there can be no difference if there is no difference in manufacturing cost. If there is no cost difference, then no difference in selling price under any conditions.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not overlook the fact that in future sales, that is, if you have offered a certain commodity at a certain price, you have to offer it to my competitor, but that does not apply—

Mr. CELLER. I am very sorry, but that is not the language you used yesterday. Why do you not accept the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. JONES], because he wants to do that very same thing?

Mr. PATMAN. Because I am not going to let the gentleman from Texas help destroy this bill. I am not going to allow the conferees to either.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I have no desire to injure and no thought of injuring the bill in any way. I expect to support the bill. I think we would help the bill by putting this provision in it. It is in the alternative. The wrong is committed if there is a difference in price that either lessens competition or tends to create monopoly or to destroy competition. It is not simply a question of creating a monopoly. It was found necessary in the old law to exempt cooperative organizations of farmers. We are simply following the same philosophy in offering this amendment to exempt them from the operations of the law. I know the sponsors of this bill are friendly to the farmers, and I wish they would agree to this amendment and let it go in to carry out the philosophy that has been practiced for 29 years.

Mr. CELLER. Let me draw your attention to the objections of the Dairymen's League of New York. There are 40,000 dairy farmers in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. It says the present law prevents price discrimination where, first, discrimination substantially lessens competition, or, second, creates monopoly. This bill provides the same price for the same goods of like grade and quality regardless of the location of the buyers.

The Dairymen's League operates in 170 markets. It says the price of milk can never be uniform in 170 markets because of, first, local competition; second, different retail prices in each market; third, different purchasing power of each community; and fourth, because milk-control boards control retail and wholesale prices in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. They sometimes make different prices in the same State. Twenty-two States fix milk prices. They must have the right to change prices to meet the prices fixed by the State boards.

The Pure Milk Association has 16,000 dairy farmers in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana. It sells milk to dealers in Chicago at 12 cents a quart. It sells milk to dealers in Hammond, Ind., at 10 cents a quart. It is obvious that if the dealers in Chicago are selling milk to consumers at 12 cents a quart, and the dealers in Hammond, Ind., are selling milk to consumers at 10 cents a quart, the Chicago dealers should be required to pay a higher price to the farmers than is paid by the Hammond dealers. Since it would obviously be impossible to charge the Hammond dealers any higher price for their milk if they are selling on a 10-cent basis, the net effect of the bill would be to require the association to sell its milk to Chicago dealers at the lower prices being charged to the Hammond dealers. The resultant loss to the farmers supplying milk to Chicago is obvious.

As another example, let us consider the case of Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., a farmer-owned and farmer-controlled cooperative association, engaged in marketing butter, cheese, and other dairy products for approximately 400 local cooperative creameries and cheese factories east of Minneapolis. Under the terms of this bill they would be required to sell at the same price in every market in which they operate, although economic conditions, such as employment, might easily require a difference in price, let us say, for example, between the city of Washington and the city of Scranton, Pa.

It should be further noted that during the whole life of the N. R. A., manufacturers, wholesalers, and jobbers attempted to obtain a definition of wholesaler and retailer in order to cripple the operations of farmers' cooperative associations which purchase from manufacturers and sell direct to their farmer members, farm equipment and supplies, including fertilizer, creamery machinery, and so forth. The Federal Trade Commission is at the present time investigating the activities of the manufacturers of butter tubs in refusing to grant Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., a wholesaler's discount upon butter tubs, although Land O'Lakes Creameries, Inc., performs all of the functions of a wholesaler with the single exception that it sells direct to its member creameries rather than through a jobber.

This attempt to salvage economic waste by legislation promoting or protecting intermediaries between the producer and consumer of goods is in direct conflict with the whole theory of cooperative marketing and cooperative purchasing.

It has been specifically pointed out that a provision was inserted in the bill to permit certain discounts to be given to wholesalers without according such discounts to other persons who purchased in similar quantities. Thus, this bill which is designed to eliminate discrimination contains a violently discriminatory provision against the cooperative purchasing of farm equipment and supplies by farm organizations in favor of the private wholesaler and jobber of farm equipment and supplies. And this discrimination is to be paid for out of the pockets of our farmers.

As pointed out above, the wholesalers and jobbers attempted to obtain this special discrimination in their favor during the whole life of the N. R. A. The situation became

so bad that President Roosevelt was forced to issue two Executive orders on the subject, in which the President stated clearly and unequivocally that no code of fair competition should be construed or interpreted so as to prevent any cooperative organization from being entitled to receive and to distribute to its members discounts (a) ordinarily paid or allowed to other purchasers for purchases in wholesale or middleman quantities, or (b) paid or allowed pursuant to the requirements or provisions of any code of fair competition to other purchasers for purchases in wholesale or middleman quantities.

In addition, a similar provision was written in the so-called Guffey Coal Act of a similar nature so as to insure that cooperatives would be entitled to wholesale or jobbers discounts in connection with the operation of the Guffey Coal Act.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Celler) there were—ayes 74, noes 86.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. JONES and Mr. MILLER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 81, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PEYSER: Page 5, line 8, after the word "quality", insert "and design"; and on page 5, in line 22, after the word "quality", insert "and design."

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Chairman, in response to the statement made a few moments ago by the gentleman from Texas that he wants to try to set up an honest and a workable bill, I am offering this very simple amendment to add the words "and design" after the word "quality" where it appears in two places on page 5; and I hope the committee will not combat this particular amendment.

I call attention to the fact that there is no differential of design in the foods and drugs, so that would have no effect against the chain stores the bill is hoping to reach; but let us assume that two articles are made from the same quality of merchandise, but one is made under one design for a certain type of trade and the other is made under another design for another type of trade. The design itself may entitle the purchaser in either case to a differential in price, even though the basic quality of the merchandise involved is similar. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing in this amendment that should in any way affect the bill in itself at all. Quality of food is not involved. There is no design in the quality of food or drugs. There may be, however, a design differential in furniture or in ladies' shoes. Through the elimination of certain material here or there an opportunity may be given for a lowering of price, whereas the quality involved is the same. Under this bill the manufacturer would be penalized severely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Would not that permit the processor of a food commodity to change from a round-shaped package to a square-shaped package and call it a difference in design?

Mr. PEYSER. Absolutely not, because that would be a change in the design of the container, whereas the amendment refers to a design in the merchandise offered for sale. There is no style in baking powder, there is no style in paragon, there is no style in castor oil. It will apply principally to textiles, probably to furniture, probably to shoes, but not to the commodities we are endeavoring to reach; and I think if the committee wants to carry out what the gentleman from Texas has suggested, a good, honest, workable bill that is fair to everybody, this is the way they can be fair.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it the gentleman's understanding that this bill as now submitted will force a shoe manufacturer, for illustration, to sell all styles of shoes for the same price?

Mr. PEYSER. If the quality is the same. My amendment adds to the word "quality" only the two words "and design." I think it is a simple amendment, and I do not see any reason why, if they want to present a fair bill, it should not be accepted.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. PEYSER. I yield.

Mr. RABAUT. How does this affect the tire business about which we have been hearing so much, the same tire sold with a different name on it, for instance?

Mr. PEYSER. If the quality were the same and the design were the same, it would be, in all component parts, the identical article. They are not going to have different designs for tires; they make them all the same.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for 3 additional minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Suppose the design of the tread of the tire were different, what would be the case?

Mr. PEYSER. That, in my judgment, would not be considered a different design.

Mr. RABAUT. That is one of the big questions we are trying to eliminate.

Mr. PEYSER. It would be done, principally, for deceit and for evasion. The design of all tires is the same; they are round. Because the design of the tread is different does not mean there is any difference in the fabric. In the matter of a suit of clothes, a stripe could be added without changing the basic quality of the garment. That design may be put in there because it is more saleable in a certain section, still there could be no deviation in the price of the basic articles, because the quality is the same in each; and I think, where they endeavor to discriminate purely on the design of the tread of a tire, it could be set up immediately that it was done merely for the purpose of evasion.

Mr. RABAUT. That is what has been done recently.

Mr. PEYSER. That would cover the design. In my judgment you are not evading a design by putting on a different tread.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, speaking on behalf of the committee, I may say that this matter has had the consideration of the committee and it feels that if the word "design" is inserted in the qualifying phrases, as suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PEYSER], the door will be open to a situation in which this bill may be flouted and the purposes of the bill destroyed.

As an example, it is felt by the committee that the same identical goods might be sold to a small-quantity purchaser for a certain price and level which would be higher than the same quality goods could be sold to the large-quantity purchaser by simply putting another label on the goods sold to the large-quantity purchaser. In other words, the design would be changed to comply with this act.

I may say that the committee feels this amendment should not be agreed to, and I call attention to the fact that the part of the Clayton Act which is now under consideration is the same in form in the present bill as in the original Clayton Act, which has been on the statute books for 24 years. After 24 years a suggestion is made that that part of the act be amended at this time. Incidentally, I

may say, with all respect and deference to my good friend from New York, the suggested amendment was proposed by one of our colleagues who appeared before the Rules Committee in opposition to the entire bill.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. A great many of the industries in Ohio were very much in favor of the proviso in the Senate bill, appearing on page 4, and reading as follows:

And provided further, That nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in price in the same or different commodities made in good faith to meet competition.

I find that on page 9 of the Patman bill, beginning in line 14, there appear these words:

Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima facie case thus made by showing that his lower price to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor.

Will the gentleman explain the difference between these two proposals?

Mr. PATMAN. If the Senate amendment should be adopted it would really destroy the bill. It would permit the corporate chains to go into a local market, cut the price down so low that it would destroy local competitors and make up for their losses in other places where they had already destroyed their competitors. One of the objects of the bill is to get around that phrase and prevent the large corporate chains from selling below cost in certain localities, thus destroying the independent merchants, and making it up at other places where their competitors have already been destroyed. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment, because it would be very destructive of the bill. The phrase "equally low price" means the corporate chain will have the right to compete with the local merchants. They may meet competition, which is all right, but they cannot cut down the price below cost for the purpose of destroying the local man.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. What does the gentleman's proviso mean?

Mr. PATMAN. It means they may meet competition, but not cut down the price below cost. It means an equally low price but not below that. It permits competition, but it does not permit them to cut the price below cost in order to destroy their competitors. I hope the gentleman will not insist on the Senate amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. I do not think the Senate provision permits them to do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to refer back to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York which pertained to the inclusion of the word "design" in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not Holy Writ and it is not a perfect document. It seems to be in the shape that the gentleman from Texas wants it, and he appeals to you not to change a single solitary word or sentence in the whole thing. This is not fair. I realize he has a steering committee here to see that the bill goes through exactly as he wants it to pass, but let me give you a little bit of the history of the bill.

The very first day it came before the Judiciary Committee the attorney who drew it realized there were imperfections in it and suggested certain amendments. It very soon became apparent to the Judiciary Committee that it was defective in many respects, and a subcommittee was appointed to rewrite it. The subcommittee spent many months in doing so. When they reported it to the full committee dozens of amendments were adopted in executive session. After it was reported here on the floor the Judiciary Committee agreed to still further amendments, which the putative author of the bill, and its chief sponsor, consented to accept.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York offered an amendment to add the word "design", so that there shall be

no discrimination in price between purchasers of goods of the same grade, quality, and "design." Obviously the backers of this bill are interested in groceries. They are not interested in clothing, wallpaper, jewelry, or any of the other innumerable things that move in interstate commerce, the prices of which are influenced by attractive and popular designs and patterns.

Permit me to give you a single example. In my city there is a manufacturer of women's shoes, and every year he offers the market 50 or 60 different designs. Some of them are popular, and he can sell them at good prices. Others do not catch the fickle fancy of our feminine friends, and they are therefore a drug on the market. They are exactly the same grade and quality, but in order to move the unpopular shoes this manufacturer has to sell them for what he can get. He can command a good price for his popular shoes. The same thing is true with china, wallpaper, furniture, fixtures, and innumerable other commodities. Why do you want to penalize that class of business? Do not be carried away just because the gentleman from Texas would have you think this is a perfect piece of work. This bill has to go to the Senate, and it will be a far different one when you see it in final form. There is a lot of perfecting yet to be done.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PEYSER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PEYSER) there were—ayes 19, nays 79.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 5, line 8, after the word "quality", insert "purchased under like conditions"; also on page 5, line 22, after the word "quality", insert "purchased under like conditions."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, for days I have been trying to get exactly what is in the mind of the gentleman from Texas about so-called discriminations in prices. I maintain, and will maintain to the end of the discussion of this bill, that from what we have heard there is no question but that there can be no right to anyone selling goods to make any different prices to different customers where the goods are of like grade and quality and quantity, the gentleman from Texas notwithstanding.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] put in the RECORD yesterday the following language:

Now, with regard to the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], here is what I said. I said that manufacturers would have to treat their customers alike and give them the same price, and I still say that. For what? For the same quantity under the same conditions. This is the part that the gentleman did not bring out. He simply failed to tell it all.

Now, I simply put his exact language in this amendment, and I say that where the goods are purchased thus under like conditions there can be no discrimination. When they are purchased under unlike conditions, the inference is there can be discrimination and change in price. That is logical and reasonable.

Now, if what the gentleman said this afternoon is so, he should not object to the amendment, as I have put his exact language in my amendment.

We know that goods may be of the same quantity, of the same quality, but may be purchased under unlike conditions. There may be different items of credit. One man may be entitled to a 60-day dating, while another man may be entitled only to cash on delivery. There may be questions of delivery datings. One man may want his deliveries within 10 days; another may want his deliveries in 60 days or 6 months or may want them daily. Certainly, where there are these different conditions, there ought to be the right given to effect a different price. He may want his goods with samples or he may want them without samples. There may be accorded the right to furnish demonstrators for toilet articles or similar goods or there may be no demonstrators. A man may have a strike on his hands or there may be a lock-out, or there may be no labor difficulties.

Certainly, if there are like conditions, there should be no discrimination, but if there are unlike conditions, which is the inference of my amendment, a man should have the right to contract under our Constitution as he sees fit and allow for these different conditions by a difference in price.

The bill, as now drafted, will not allow these differences and I urge upon you sincerely that you allow such differences, because of differing or unlike conditions. Put in the words to which the gentleman from Texas always adverts, namely "like conditions." He reiterates, "Under the same or like conditions." Put them in now. He questioned me yesterday and took me to task because I did not include these words. I include them now in the amendment and I offer them for your judicial and earnest consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York is conscientiously opposed to this bill, and, naturally, he is going to do what he can to weaken it. If you were to adopt this amendment he would not vote for the bill. Therefore, he is trying to perfect it for us. So if it is already satisfactory to those of us who have been working on it in the committee and with the other sponsors of the legislation, why should he not let us have the bill we want.

If you put these words in the place where he proposes to insert them, without a sufficient explanation, you will just confuse the bill. You will have confusing language by placing them where he has proposed to put them.

What are the conditions? Delivery by truck, delivery over the railroad, delivery on a barge, delivery at a certain point that is a few miles removed from the other competitor. Any condition like this would remove the case from a question of discrimination if you were to adopt the gentleman's amendment.

The committee worked on this bill for months and a subcommittee worked on it for months. It is true they agreed to some amendments, but they have got a bill they think is all right, and I hope you do not amend it by putting in the weasel phrases and these statements that sound all right, but upon second thought or upon reflection or upon analysis, you find some of them are destructive of the purposes of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to cut off anyone from debating amendments on the bill, but I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement under which all debate on amendments may close.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have an amendment that I desire to offer.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments to this section close in 30 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, this is a highly controversial bill, and a great many Members are interested and desire to offer amendments. To cut off debate in 30 minutes would be harmful.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says "on this section." That would end debate.

Mr. MILLER. That would end debate.

Mr. MICHENER. It would end debate in 30 minutes. I am going to vote for the bill, but there are many far-reaching provisions in the bill, and I think the gentleman ought not to close debate. I hope he will withdraw his request.

Mr. MILLER. I will withdraw the request, Mr. Chairman, for the time being.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLOOM: Page 9, line 6, after the word "commodities", change the period to a colon and insert "Provided, That nothing herein contained shall apply to payments for window

or counter displays actually made or signs actually used in advertising or displaying a vendor's products on the premises of a vendee."

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of Members to paragraph (d). At no place in the bill is the word "advertising" used. It might refer to advertising, but it does not specifically say so. Now, clause (d) reads, as follows:

(d) That it shall be unlawful for any person engaged in commerce to pay or contract for the payment of anything of value to or for the benefit of a customer of such person in the course of such commerce as compensation or in consideration for any services or facilities furnished by or through such customer in connection with the processing, handling, sale, or offering for sale of any products or commodities manufactured, sold, or offered for sale by such person, unless such payment or consideration is available on proportionally equal terms to all other customers competing in the distribution of such products or commodities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that means just this: Remember it says "proportionally." In other words, this will prevent any manufacturer that is starting new in a business from having an opportunity of putting his goods on the market in the manner merchants have been doing for the last 50 years.

I am particularly interested in this one section for this reason: Forty years ago, in 1896, I started a music publishing business, and my success in the business at that time in Chicago was brought about by displaying in the window wax figures of a song I had at that time.

Under this provision, it could not be done. "Proportionally", it says. In other words, if the Coca Cola Co. should make a contract with a store, whether a drug store or grocery store or whatever it may be, and should say, if you buy \$100 worth of goods we will give you a sign, then the fellow in the next street, or on the next corner, if he purchased only \$50 worth of goods, according to this proposed bill, could have only half a sign. That is what it says. You cannot get away from the fact that this is not workable.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Is there anything to keep the Coca Cola Co., or any other company, from going to drug stores and saying they want a certain amount of space?

Mr. BLOOM. No; you cannot do that under this section. You prevent it from being done.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman says that it cannot be done. The Coca Cola Co. under this bill could give anybody all the space they saw fit, but they could not give a discount or a lower price to someone for space which is not used.

Mr. BLOOM. That has nothing to do with this section. This is for services or facilities furnished. It has nothing to do with price.

Mr. MICHENER. But that is where these phony discriminations come in. They claim they render a service which they do not render.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. To finish this up, that is one of the troubles and discriminations here—that one of these manufacturers will sell to one store, say, a million units, provided they do so much advertising, and then, in turn, will exchange checks and pay the purchaser for doing the advertising, and the advertising consists in hanging up a two by four sign.

Mr. BLOOM. I did not yield for a speech. My amendment just takes care of that and provides for an emergency of that kind. It provides that nothing herein contained shall apply to payments for windows or counter display actually made or signs actually used in advertising or displaying the vendor's products on the premises of a vendee. It must be actually done, and if it is not a bona-fide contract, of course, then this would not apply; but if you have a window at

Fourteenth and F Streets and the manufacturer wants to make a contract with that store at Fourteenth and F Streets where thousands of people pass by every day, are you going to pay the same price for one down at Fourth and B Streets where only 50 people pass in the course of a day? My amendment would provide a fair way of advertising in that window or counter display.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Under the gentleman's amendment, at Fourteenth and F Streets, suppose I purchased 10,000 units with an agreement with the gentleman that I will sell through that distributing store, provided he gives me certain advertising allowances. If a man at Seventh and F Streets purchases the same number of units and makes the same distribution, is he entitled to the same advertising benefits?

Mr. BLOOM. That does not affect it here at all. I leave the word "proportionately" in. I am mentioning advertising specifically. I am saying to you this can be done, leaving this the way it is. You give every one the same kind of a deal all the way through. There is no discrimination here, but you have not advertising in here. There is no way that you can read advertising into it, notwithstanding the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU] say there is. The word "advertising" is not in this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would read it in the words of line 22, page 8, where it says anything of value.

Mr. BLOOM. You can read it in, but it is not mentioned. You can read anything into it, and that is the trouble with the bill all the way through. You are reading a lot of things into the bill, but my amendment allows fair play to the manufacturer, and does not allow the destruction of the little manufacturer who wants to introduce his goods, but he cannot do it under this section of the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As I understand it, he could give the same benefit to all of the customers in the bill.

Mr. BLOOM. He could not do it; it would be impossible. There are no two windows alike, no two counters alike. One side of the street is different from the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. With all due deference to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom], I may say that the committee, in considering the measure, gave a great deal of time to a discussion of the very things suggested by the gentleman from New York. It is the opinion of the committee that the bill in the form in which it is presented to the House fully protects all purchasers in the matter of advertising discounts, but it is also the opinion of the committee, after due deliberation, that if the bill were amended in the manner suggested by the gentleman from New York, it would be destructive of the purposes intended by the bill itself.

In other words, if you eliminate from consideration in this bill, in the matter of advertising discounts, window display, a situation might exist in which a company which does window-display advertising might put one of its display outfits in a window and then grant to a purchaser a substantial discount on account of that very fact. The bill as it is now drawn takes care of the situation amply.

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield.

Mr. CURLEY. This bill, as I understand it, is fair; but how does it provide for these so-called loss leaders that we have so much talk about in the city of New York?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. The gentleman's question is not germane to the point I am discussing. The gentleman can ask to strike out the last word and address himself to that point.

Mr. CURLEY. That is the question I asked the gentleman from New York.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. As a matter of fact, it will be taken care of, in the opinion of this committee, if this bill is passed, but I do not have time to go into that now.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. My amendment protects that; this being advertising, show-window and display advertising, that is actually made and delivered.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I understand that.

Mr. BLOOM. There is no fictitious advertising that can enter into it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I understand that.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman said advertising discounts. It is not advertising discounts at all. These people merely make a contract for a window display or a counter display, and that contract is a matter of public record, and the price they pay for it is a matter of record. There is nothing fictitious about it. It is actually made and paid for.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That contract contemplates that the manufacturer will pay the seller a certain amount for the use of his window.

Mr. BLOOM. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is a discount under another name.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it the gentleman's thought that you cannot make any more window-display contracts?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Certainly not, but you can make them only on proportionately equal terms to all customers competing in the distribution of such product or commodity.

Mr. BLOOM. How can you do it on proportionately equal terms when there are no two places alike? Suppose one store is 25 feet and the other store is only 10 feet; what are you going to do with the 10-foot fellow? Give him a half a sign?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. You can give him a smaller sign. You do not have to cut the sign in two.

Mr. BLOOM. Then you will have all different kinds of signs; is that the idea?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. They have all different kinds of signs now. What do you do today?

Mr. BLOOM. We do not do that. We would go broke if we did.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. At any rate, I may say that the amendment proposed has the effect, in the opinion of the committee, of destroying the very purpose of the bill so far as it affects the protection of the small purchaser on advertising discounts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to ask the gentleman from Nebraska or some other member of the committee the same question I asked the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom]. I do not read anything in this bill which would prevent the Coca Cola Co., for instance, from going to a druggist and making an agreement with him to put a sign across the top of his window. They can either pay him for it or they could do it for nothing. Am I correct?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. That is correct. But there must be no discrimination. He has to do it under such terms and conditions that there is no discrimination between competitors.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman does not understand my question. I say if he goes there, not in connection with the sale of Coca Cola, but goes to the merchant and says, "I want to put a Coca-Cola sign across the top of your window", but it has no connection with a sale, there is nothing to prevent that, is there?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. They would no doubt take into consideration whether or not that was a subterfuge in a sale or an independent transaction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bloom].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.
The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CULKIN: On page 9, strike out the proviso at the end of subsection (e), beginning in line 14 and ending in line 18, and insert the following: "Provided, however, That nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the prima-facie case thus made by showing that the discrimination in price or furnishing of service or other facilities to any purchaser or purchasers was made in good faith to meet competition."

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset, for the purpose of meeting the probable suggestion that I am opposed to this bill, that I am not opposed to this bill. I am going to vote for it whether or not this amendment is adopted.

I have offered this amendment at the request of the farm organizations of America. The Members of the House received a letter from the various farm organizations, including the Farmers' National Grain Corporation, Northwestern Farmers' Union Legislative Committee, American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Producers' Association, in which it set forth a number of reasons why they were opposed to this bill. The amendment which I am now offering embodies one of those objections.

May I say that the farm cooperatives are, to my mind, the truly rational developments of American farming. Artificial aid of Government has never really functioned, but where the farmers have gone into cooperatives and have stood together shoulder to shoulder they have, as a rule, solved their problems. Through these organization they have eliminated one and sometimes two middlemen, and both the farmer and consumer are benefited.

Here is the way this bill, as it now stands, affects the Land O'Lakes cooperative, a great Minnesota dairy outfit:

This cooperative is selling butter in an eastern city. It goes to a local merchant, a grocer, we will say, and offers him some butter. He has been a regular customer. The grocer tells this Land O'Lakes representative: "I cannot buy your product; Swift, or Armour, is underselling you."

"All right; we will meet the competition. What are they offering?"

"Well, I cannot tell you what the packers are selling me for."

"Well, I will offer so-and-so."

"It is not a sufficient reduction."

"Then I will offer such a reduction."

Finally a price is agreed on. The grocer under that scheme of things does not disclose the price the packer is selling him the goods for; so this legislation is not copperplate, as the gentleman from Texas suggested, but it imposes an impossible duty upon this farm cooperative in selling its products under those circumstances.

I ask you gentlemen to consider the status of the farm cooperatives. They are carrying their own, they are ably officered. They are officered by intelligent, honest men, many of whom have come from the soil. Today they are marketing in America approximately \$2,000,000,000 of farm products. One-quarter of the farm income is derived through the operation of these farm cooperatives. They speak vigorously and in thunder tones against this provision of the bill.

The zealous attitude, the zeal of the gentleman from Texas, is to be commended in this connection. He is a vigorous personality and has won his spurs in the House. I hope he will not take on the status of a killer and in fact destroy his own excellent work in this field by writing this impossible provision into this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. WOODRUM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. I yield briefly.

Mr. FLETCHER. How differently does the gentleman's amendment affect the situation?

Mr. CULKIN. It does not require this cooperative to show at what price the other fellow is selling. That is what the

bill as it is written requires. It imposes an impossible condition on the selling cooperative.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. Briefly.

Mr. CELLER. In our State we have a milk-control board. They fix the price of milk. Certainly those outside the State selling in New York State should be able to meet that competition.

Mr. CULKIN. What the gentleman says is true. I want to call the attention of the House to this further fact. We have at the other end of this building a body known as the Senate which sometimes develops original traits; but they have already passed this bill and written into it the language:

Nothing herein contained shall prevent discrimination in prices made in good faith to meet competition.

That is what my amendment says, and I ask the members of the committee in all fairness to accept this really constructive amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate what the gentleman says, but this amendment, while offered under the guise of protecting farm cooperative associations, if adopted will open wide the gates not only to farm cooperatives but to every other kind of organization.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 7, line 7, after the word "established", insert a new section, to be known as subsection 2 (a) and to read as follows:

"That nothing herein contained shall be construed or applied in such a way as to increase the cost of goods, wares, or merchandise to the consumer."

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, all this amendment does is to effect exactly what the proponents of the bill say it will do, namely, not increase the price of any goods, wares, or merchandise to the consumer.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 6, strike out lines 23, 24, and 25, and strike out also, on page 7, lines 1 to 7, inclusive.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MEAD). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. What I seek to do by this amendment is to strike out what is known as the obnoxious restrictions concerning quantity discounts. The Borah-Van Nuys amendment provides that any discount may be given provided it is given equally to everyone under like conditions. The pending bill, however, states that you cannot treat everybody alike but that the Federal Trade Commission shall have something to say about it, shall have the right to fix a limitation beyond which you cannot go, regardless of the fact the buyer may purchase a million units and that millions of dollars may be involved in the order. The Federal Trade Commission can say: "Thus far you may go and no farther." It could under the bill—but not under the Constitution—interfere with your right of contract.

I have been criticized and twitted considerably because I have sought in a way to advance the opinions of the farm organizations in this Chamber. These farm organizations have seen fit to write to me. I do not know a single solitary representative of a farm organization; I would not know them if I were to fall over them; yet they have written to me because they look upon me as one who is seeking to advance their cause. I cannot help that. [Laughter.] I want to read to you this letter, whether you like it or not, whether you take me humorously or seriously. I asked them whether they were satisfied with the wording of the bill with reference to quantity discounts, because these are huge cooperative organizations buying and selling in trainload lots;

they indicated to me they were dissatisfied. This is the response I received from Mr. Chester Gray, Washington representative of the American Farm Bureau Federation. I herewith give you his letter and my communication to him.

MAY 26, 1936.

MR. CHESTER GRAY,
Washington representative,
American Farm Bureau Federation,
Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. GRAY: I note the various objections to the pending Patman bill, H. R. 8442, as set forth in the letter of May 25 signed by yourself and four other leading farm organizations.

Your letter is not clear, however, as to your attitude toward the section dealing with allowable quantity discounts—section 2 (a), subsection (2), on page 6, beginning with line 18.

You indicate in your letter that you favor elimination of "false allowances, false advertising allowances, and unreasonable quantity discounts." The inference is, of course, that you would insist on provisions in the bill to allow quantity discounts to cooperatives and all other large buyers, which would make it possible to pass on to such buyers the full savings of such quantity purchases; that is, savings in costs to the manufacturer due to elimination of selling expenses, advertising, warehousing, and similar overhead items.

Are you satisfied that the language of subsection (2) on page 6 permits of the full realization of these savings to cooperatives and other large buyers?

The language as it appears in the bill would seem to provide for such price differentials, but the special interpretation given this language by both the House committee and the Senate committee materially changes the apparent meaning of that language, in my opinion.

I should be glad to have your views on this point.

Very truly yours,

EMANUEL CELLER.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 26, 1936.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN CELLER: Replying to your letter of May 26, relative to the position of the farm organizations on the quantity-discount paragraph of the Patman bill (H. R. 8442), will say that this farm organization—and I believe all others—would insist on provisions which allow the full savings and economies of quantity purchases to be passed on by the manufacturer to such purchasers. It is only the unreasonable quantity discount which should be eliminated.

We have been somewhat puzzled by the special interpretation of the language of subsection (2) of section 2 (a), as given in the committee reports. These interpretations do seem to go far beyond the apparent meaning and intent of the language of the bill, which says that price discriminations between purchasers may be made "which make only due allowance for differences in the cost of manufacture, sale, or delivery resulting from the differing methods or quantities in which such commodities are to such purchasers sold or delivered." The language of the bill seems so clear at this point that we have been inclined to take it at face value, rather than to accept the explanation in the committee report.

If you think there is any possibility that the narrow interpretation of the committee might in later court action be adopted as the meaning of the language of the bill, we would be glad to join with you in endeavoring to get this language changed.

We would like to have you ask those in charge of this bill to state whether this language would permit the full economies of mass buying to be passed on to the buyer or whether such a buyer would be required to pay for facilities which he does not utilize, such as a pro-rata share of salesmen's expenses, advertising, warehousing, etc.?

If you do not get a satisfactory answer, we would urge you to insist upon changes in the language so as to allow all of the economies of mass cooperative buying to be passed on to the buyers.

Very respectfully,

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
CHESTER H. GRAY,
Washington Representative.

What does that mean? Suppose one of these cooperative farm organizations wants to buy some fertilizer. They go to a manufacturer and say, "We want to buy \$50,000 worth of your products. We do not want to use your salesmen. We do not want to use your wholesalers or your jobbers. We do not want to avail ourselves of the benefit of any of your advertising, radio broadcasts, or any of that type of overhead. Now, what does it cost to conduct these radio programs?" The manufacturer says, "5 percent." "What is your advertising budget?" Another 5 percent. "What do you pay your salesmen?" Another 5 percent. The statement is made, "We are not going to use those facilities; therefore we want you to allow us the 15 percent."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, they say, "We are not using the 15 percent that you have to lay out in these various directions. We want that difference allowed us. We do not use those facilities, so why should we not receive that difference which you otherwise pay for your advertising, for your radio, and for your wholesalers and salesmen?"

The farm organizations say that the quantity discount provisions as contained in this bill would not permit them to make these savings. It would not permit the manufacturers to give these allowances. The farm organizations and other large mass buyers feel they therefore would be prejudiced greatly by this bill. These savings they would be enabled to pass on to the farm cooperatives just as the other mass buyers would be precluded from passing on those savings to the consumers.

May I ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] whether or not he is willing to abide by what these farm organizations say in this regard?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, no real farm organization or no real farmer will oppose what this bill proposes to do in this regard. This bill seeks to prevent monopoly, the very thing that the farmer wants to prevent, and no friend of the farmer would want that provision stricken from the bill.

Mr. CELLER. I submit that is not an answer. I ask the gentleman what he thought of this letter from the farm organization with reference to a specific objection, and he speaks of monopolies. There is no monopoly anywhere. The Federal Trade Commission spent over a year and \$1,000,000 to find out whether there was a monopoly in any trade or industry, and reported back there was no monopoly. So all this talk about monopolies and the great chain stores controlling everything in sight is just pure bunk and balderdash.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the favorable consideration of this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe we have debated these various amendments sufficiently. I think the membership understands them clearly. Therefore I ask for a vote upon the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: Page 7, line 7, after the word "established", insert: "And provided further, That the Federal Trade Commission is hereby empowered and directed, after due investigation and after hearings afforded to all interested parties, to determine, fix, and establish, and after like investigation and hearings, to modify and revise from time to time the maximum amounts (based on the percentage of the value of the merchandise affected, or otherwise) of the freight charges to be assumed, absorbed, or paid by a seller upon the sale of such merchandise; and the assumption, absorption, or payment of such freight charges in excess of the maximum amounts determined, fixed, and established as above provided shall be deemed to constitute unlawful price discrimination, and is hereby forbidden."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I was in hopes that the amendment which I have just offered would meet with the approval of the gentlemen in charge of the bill, as I consider it in thorough accord with the purposes of the bill. We now have a law which prohibits railroads from indulging in discrimination, a law which prevents them from giving rebates so far as freight charges are concerned. We have, however, no law affecting the freight charges paid by shippers. I have in mind a manufacturing concern in my district that informed me they are very much interested in this question. If they make a certain price to retailers and then

a larger manufacturing concern or importer by selling much larger quantities can afford to pay the freight, or a large proportion of the freight charges to the point of destination, it would be contrary to the purposes of this bill.

In this bill we give the Federal Trade Commission power to investigate and fix quantity discounts. This amendment would give them the same power to prevent similar discriminations with reference to the payment of freight charges to destination.

Mr. Chairman, I do not care to discuss the question further, but I hope the gentlemen in charge of the bill will see their way clear to accept the amendment. I consider it in thorough accord with the purposes of the bill, and I may say that I am for the bill with or without this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, some of us have gone into this question rather fully with the gentleman from Texas and others who are in favor of the amendment, and we do not think it is in accord with the purposes of this bill. It is what some call the basing point in reverse. This is a question that might well be considered in a separate bill, and I hope the gentleman from Texas will present the matter in a separate bill and urge consideration of it in that way and not attach it to this bill which is for a definite purpose that is not in accord with the amendment in our judgment. Therefore I ask that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBERTSON: Page 7, line 9, after the word "where", insert "to avoid the hazards of depreciation of value of the product through decline of markets, or."

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that I can offer an amendment that is in accord with the purposes of the bill. As a matter of fact, I have been assured by the committee members that the provisions contained in my amendment are already in subsection 3 on page 7 of the bill. At this point I want to repeat what I have previously said. No one is more interested than I in seeing eliminated and cured the abuses that have developed in the field of merchandising, much to the detriment of the independent merchants, but I do think we should make a serious effort to get as good a bill as we can.

The committee members contend that under subsection 3 the language, which authorizes price changes in response to changing conditions affecting the markets is sufficient to permit a man who has a perishable product to be marketed to cut his price in anticipation of a declining market in the future. My contention is that the committee bill takes into consideration only a condition that now exists, and in substantiation of that I point to the fact that they give these instances in that connection: "Such as imminent deterioration of perishable goods, obsolescence of seasonal goods, distress sales under court processes." These are conditions of a bad market that already exists.

Now, should not a man with apples or potatoes or vegetables, or any other kind of fruit, be permitted to exercise his sound judgment and discretion and anticipating the hazards of his market, cut the price when he thinks the market may decline, although the decline has not actually hit him. There is no use of giving a man the privilege of cutting his price when the market has already declined. He will have to then take what he can get.

We should be willing to put in this bill in haec verbis what the chairman of the committee assures me is in here, namely, that a man can cut his prices under circumstances of this kind in anticipation of the hazards of a decline of the market. If it is in here, why object to putting in language that we can all agree upon?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Could not the seller do that under the bill if he offer the reduced price to everybody alike without any discrimination?

Mr. ROBERTSON. Yes; I think possibly he could, but this may happen. In the morning of one day he sells to one man at one price and he learns of conditions that may affect his market—they have not happened, but in his judgment they are going to happen—and he wants to unload, and in the same town he sells at a lower price, which I say, as this section is now worded, he could not do with safety.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I ask that I may have 2 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. That is all right.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas one question which has not been satisfactorily discussed. My understanding is that the proviso, which, I believe, is in section 2 of the Clayton Act, is only referred to in this bill by implication, and there is no express repeal of it. Is this the fact?

Mr. MILLER. No; in this bill we amend section 2 of the Clayton Act "so as to read as follows", and this does away with the provisos in it. It is a reproduction of the same language.

Mr. MASSINGALE. It is a reproduction of the same language?

Mr. PATMAN. Except that all the weasel phrases are cut out.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to delay the House in the consideration of this bill. A short time ago I called attention to the desires of the steel industries in Ohio to have the proviso in the Senate bill put into the House bill. And in support of their contention I want to read a few lines. They say:

If this amendment is not retained, then we are out of business for long-distance shipments. This is a very vital amendment and must remain in the bill, if monopolies due to geographical locations are not to be created. In other words, unless we have this amendment, the local seller can reduce his price so that the distant manufacturer cannot possibly compete, and competition is ruined. You know the result, of course, when the distant manufacturer has dried up and torn down his mills to save taxes; then the local manufacturer increases prices because his competition has been removed.

I wanted to make that statement so that it can go into the RECORD, and I trust the proviso in the Senate bill will be accepted by the House.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, I may say that the committee gave due consideration to his proposed amendment, and feels that if the amendment is adopted it will open the door to a situation in which the manufacturer or anyone engaged in a selling activity could discriminate and excuse the discrimination on the ground of a future drop in the market.

The committee feels that section 3 is drawn to take care of that situation, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the Sugar Institute case relied upon by the distinguished attorney from New York [Mr. CELLER], who stated, on page 8342 of the RECORD, that any lawyer worth his salt would have to say that this bill is unconstitutional. He gave us an excerpt from that case which in itself, if properly applied, shows the contrary and that this bill is really constitutional.

But I want to call attention to another thing that the Supreme Court said in that case:

The restrictions imposed by the Sherman Act are not mechanical or artificial. We have repeatedly said that they set up the essential standard of reasonableness. (*Standard Oil Co. v. United States*, 221 U. S. 1; *United States v. American Tobacco Co.*, 221 U. S. 106.) They are aimed at contracts and combinations which "by reason of intent or the inherent nature of the contemplated acts, prejudice the public interests by unduly restraining competition or unduly obstructing the course of trade" (*Nash v. United States*, 229 U. S. 373, 376; *United States v. American Linseed Oil Co.*, 262 U. S.

371, 388, 389). Designed to frustrate unreasonable restraints, they do not prevent the adoption of reasonable means to protect interstate commerce from destructive or injurious practices and to promote competition upon a sound basis.

This bill is exactly in line with that decision. It is an attempt to adopt reasonable means to protect interstate commerce from destructive and injurious practices and to promote competition on a sound basis. It is designed to do away with fraudulent practices and secret rebates. It prevents unfair and destructive discriminations which work against the small country storekeeper and in favor of the big and powerful merchant. It prevents unfair discriminations only. It allows and upholds fair and open practices. For example, it allows proper and reasonable discounts and allowances for quantity purchasing. But such discounts and allowances must not be tricky and fraudulent ones. They must not be allowances which are discriminatory. The jobber, under the bill, will have a perfect right to give discounts resulting from quantity purchases provided that these discounts have a reasonable relation to the transaction itself and are based on the difference in the cost of manufacture or of sale or of delivery. What else ought they to be based upon? The manufacturer can give a discount to quantity purchasers if it is based upon a difference in the cost of manufacturing a large quantity instead of the small amount; or if it is based upon the difference in selling a large quantity instead of a small amount; or if it is based upon the difference in cost of delivering a quantity instead of a small amount. The bill has been misrepresented in this respect. And these are the very kind or character of things that were upheld in the Sugar Institute case. In that case the lower court enjoined the sugar-refining companies from engaging in some 45 activities. About 2 months ago the Supreme Court of the United States passed upon it and upheld about 42 or 43 of these injunctions, and thereby appellants were prevented from doing many things that were in restraint of interstate and foreign commerce in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. Instead of being an authority against the legality of the present proposal, the Sugar Institute case undoubtedly warrants us in saying that the present bill is constitutional. Just why the distinguished jurist and gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] cited it and quoted from it is very strange. And when he said in his speech that any lawyer worth his salt would have to agree that the present bill is unconstitutional, he was undoubtedly indulging in hyperbole, which in rhetoric is defined to be a figure of speech in which the expression is exaggerated fancifully through excitement or for effect.

Along the same line, something has been said in argument about the burden of proof, and it has been asserted that the bill is not constitutional because those who have specific and certain knowledge of their own good faith are permitted to prove it. We should distinguish between the duty of going forward with the evidence and the burden of proof. It is often wise to place the burden of producing evidence on the party best able to sustain it. It is very often held that where the party who does not have the original burden of proof, but who does possess positive and complete knowledge concerning the existence of facts which his opponent is called upon to negative; or, where, for any reason, the evidence to prove a fact is chiefly, if not entirely, within the control of the party who does not have the general or original burden of proof, then the burden of going forward with and producing this evidence rests upon him who does have the facts primarily and chiefly within his possession.

Paragraph (e) of section 2 of the bill does not provide that the burden of proof shall shift at any stage of the proceedings. On the other hand, it provides that, after it has been shown that a discrimination in price has really occurred, then the duty of going forward with the evidence to show justification and good faith rests upon the party who has almost exclusive possession of such evidence of good faith, and who has easy means of proving it. We should pass the bill and send it to conference.

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Yes.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] early this afternoon stated a case where an apple grower sells 10,000 bushels of apples for a dollar a bushel and then receives a cable from Liverpool saying that the market in Europe is going to pieces, and, on account of that and in anticipation of the bad market here, sells in the same city of Cincinnati 100,000 bushels of apples at 75 cents a bushel to another customer, and the gentleman stated that under this act the apple farmer would be liable to the penalty clauses of the bill. Is that correct or not?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Of course, there is no penalty clause in the bill, in the first place. But if there were, I would say, in the opinion of the committee, he would not be liable.

Mr. BIERMANN. What excuse would he have for doing that?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. He would have the excuse provided in the bill in its present form in paragraph 3—that nothing therein contained shall prevent price changes from time to time in response to changing conditions affecting the market.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Then the gentleman admits that he cannot anticipate a change, but that it must exist.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ROBERTSON) there were—ayes 23, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CITRON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to insert them in the place where the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] earlier in the day yielded to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 9, line 24, after the word "association", insert a new subsection as subsection (g), as follows:

"Nothing herein shall prevent price discriminations to meet competition resulting from the importation of goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured, grown, or produced outside of continental United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CELLER: Page 9, line 19, strike out all in lines 19 to 24, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Nothing in this section contained shall prevent the payment or acceptance of commissions, brokerage, or other compensation to or by cooperative organizations, corporate or otherwise, for actual services rendered or performed in the purchase or sale of merchandise where such cooperative organizations return to their constituent members or stockholders the whole or any part of the net surplus derived from their operations, in the form of dividends or otherwise."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee will rise. Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MEAD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8442, and that, pursuant to Resolution 523, he reported the same back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-eight Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 111]

Adair	Duffey, Ohio	Lanham	Rayburn
Andresen	Dunn, Miss.	Larrabee	Sanders, La.
Andrew, Mass.	Englebright	Lea, Calif.	Schaefer
Andrews, N. Y.	Ferguson	Lee, Okla.	Sears
Barden	Fernandez	Lewis, Md.	Short
Blackney	Fish	McGroarty	Sisson
Brennan	Gearhart	McLean	Steagall
Brooks	Gray, Pa.	McSwain	Utterback
Buckley, N. Y.	Green	Montet	Wadsworth
Bulwinkle	Gwynne	Moran	Werner
Burch	Higgins, Mass.	Norton	Wilcox
Carter	Hoeppel	O'Day	Wood
Cary	Hope	Oliver	Zioncheck
Casey	Huddleston	O'Malley	
Culkin	Jenckes, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.	
Disney	Kee	Powers	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-four Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIES) there were—ayes 290 and noes 16.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The title was amended to read: "A bill to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes."

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to prefer a unanimous-consent request.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 3154, which is a bill passed by the Senate dealing with the same subject matter as the bill H. R. 8442, be taken from the Speaker's table and amended by striking out all after the enacting clause and inserting the provisions of the House bill which has just been passed, and then I shall move to vacate the proceedings by which the House bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3154, strike out all after the enacting clause, and substitute the provisions of the House bill which has just been passed. Is there objection?

Mr. PEYSER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

TRANSPORTATION OF MERCHANDISE BY OTHER THAN COMMON CARRIERS IN THE PORT OF NEW YORK

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 589, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of

bonded merchandise by other than common carriers in the port of New York district. That is a privilege that is accorded every port in the United States. However, the situation in New York is different. The port of New York district, under executive order of the President, embraces three ports, the ports of New York, Perth Amboy, and Newark. They are all in one district, created by Executive order of the President. It is the custom in other ports to move this merchandise in bond by the importers or private carriers. Under the situation which existed in New York until recently, we had that privilege. However, a late ruling of the Secretary has held, under section 551 of the Tariff Act of 1930 and 873-A of the Customs Regulations of 1931, that on account of the peculiar conditions at New York, this merchandise would have to move by common carrier, and not as in other port districts.

There are no facilities for the movement of these goods between ports in that district by common carrier. The oil and the lumber industries are particularly affected. They have specially designed trucks and lighters to transport this oil and lumber. There are no facilities furnished by common carriers whatever. It is in order to give the privilege to these industries to move their bonded merchandise as in other ports that this resolution is offered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is this a unanimous report from the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. KENNEY. It is a unanimous report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this in any way affect the obligation of the bond?

Mr. KENNEY. None whatever.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Regardless of whether it is carried by contract carrier or by common carrier, the bond still is in force and effect?

Mr. KENNEY. Absolutely. The merchandise will be bonded in any event.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, was this ruling made by Executive order?

Mr. KENNEY. The ruling was made by the Secretary of the Treasury recently, that the cartage would have to be by common carrier, although for years, up until recently, the port of New York had the same privilege as other ports. However, by reason of the fact that the Executive order creating the port of New York district reserved to the ports of Perth Amboy and New York the rights and privileges of separate ports of entry, this amendment now is necessary in order to cure the inequitable situation existing in the port of New York.

Mr. RICH. It is to perfect the inequalities in the Executive order.

Mr. KENNEY. No; it is not that. The Executive order was issued following an act of Congress which approved a treaty between the States of New York and New Jersey.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KENNEY. I yield.

Mr. CROWTHER. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the other Members present that this bill was given careful consideration by the subcommittee and also by the full committee and was reported unanimously. It does not in any way endanger the revenue. It is made necessary by the inclusion of these three ports as one—Newark, Perth Amboy, and New York City.

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this in any way affect the present lottery laws?

Mr. KENNEY. Not at all, but I may say to the gentleman from Texas that yesterday up in Pennsylvania Senator Nye made a statement in which he said that within the next 10 years there would be a legal lottery law. My every effort is to bring this law into effect within 1 year. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized, when it appears to him to be in the interest of commerce, and notwithstanding any provision of law or regulation requiring that the transportation of imported merchandise be by a bonded common carrier, to permit such merchandise which has been entered and examined for customs purposes to be transported by bonded cartmen or bonded lightermen between the ports of New York, Newark, and Perth Amboy, which are all included in customs collection district no. 10 (New York): *Provided*, That this resolution shall not be construed to deprive any of the ports affected of its rights and privileges as a port of entry.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND TO KENTUCKY

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 11916) to authorize the transfer of a certain piece of land in Muhlenberg County, Ky., to the State of Kentucky, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. SPENCE. This is a piece of land that was ceded to the National Government by the State of Kentucky in 1886 for lock and dam purposes. A highway has been built upon the land and now they want to make the highway a permanent structure, but the Highway Commission of the State of Kentucky will not proceed with it unless title to this land is vested in the State of Kentucky.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why should we take the bill up tonight instead of waiting until the Consent Calendar is called on Monday?

Mr. SPENCE. This is the bill of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY], who is sick in the hospital.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It will not make any difference in the status of the matter whether it is considered today or Monday, will it?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not think there is any possible objection to this particular bill. It is only a small piece of land, sixty-five one-hundredths of an acre, which the War Department values at \$5.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If we are going to pass all these bills by unanimous consent there will be nothing to do on Monday.

Mr. SPENCE. That will not be any great calamity, will it?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think they ought to be taken up in the regular way.

Mr. SPENCE. I ask the gentleman to be a little indulgent about this bill. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARY] has had no opportunity to be here to take care of it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is the bill accompanied by a report from any committee?

Mr. SPENCE. Yes; the Committee on Rivers and Harbors reported the bill favorably. The War Department values the land at \$5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is authorized to convey to the Commonwealth of Kentucky for State road purposes, without expense to the United States, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a certain piece of land in Muhlenberg County, Ky., described as follows:

Beginning at a point in the property line between the United States and R. V. Hammers and wife, the said point of beginning being 30 feet left and opposite station 905+40 in the center line of survey made by the Kentucky State Highway Commission; thence running with the said property line south 31° E. 295 feet, more or less, to a point in the property line between the United States and J. S. Bowles and wife, the said point being 23 feet left and opposite station 908+23 in the center line of survey; thence running with the last-named property line south 60° E. 21 feet,

more or less, to a point 30 feet left and opposite station 908+40 in the center line of survey; thence running 30 feet from and parallel with the center line of 2°41' curve in a northwesterly direction 182 feet, more or less, to a point 30 feet left and opposite station 906+58.7 in the center line of survey; thence continuing 30 feet from and parallel with the center line of 16° curve 182 feet, more or less, to the point of beginning, as shown by plans on file at the office of the State highway department, Frankfort, Ky.

Such conveyance shall contain the express condition that if the State of Kentucky shall at any time cease to use said land for road or highway purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such land, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS PASCAGOULA RIVER, WILKERSON'S FERRY, MISS.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 4533) granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wilkerson's Ferry, Miss.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, will not the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. COLMER. The bill provides for the erection of a free bridge across this river, which is in Jackson County, Miss., at a place where a small hand ferry is now being operated. It merely gives the State highway department the authority to construct a free bridge across the river at that point.

Mr. HOLMES. The gentleman is merely taking the precaution of getting the consent of Congress so that in the future should the question of the navigability of the stream at that point be raised, the gentleman will not be faced with the fact that he has not the sanction of Congress.

Mr. COLMER. That is so.

Mr. HOLMES. Otherwise it is an intrastate bridge and Congress would have no jurisdiction over it.

Mr. COLMER. Quite so.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, do I understand that this bridge will be paid for wholly by the State and that there will be no bonds which will have to be retired from revenues?

Mr. COLMER. I may say in answer to the question that there have been no definite provisions made for the construction of a bridge at this point. This merely authorizes the State highway department to construct a free bridge.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I infer from the fact this is a free bridge that there will be no tolls charged for the use of it, and it will be constructed at the expense of the State of Mississippi?

Mr. COLMER. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I want to congratulate the gentleman on offering such a bill. It is rather unusual.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Pascagoula River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Wilkerson's Ferry, Miss., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters", approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. F. U. PAINTER, ET AL.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9125) for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amelia A. Daimwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire,

Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, and Dr. E. O. Arnold. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amella A. Dalmwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire, Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, Dr. E. O. Arnold, and Jennie Chapman."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this bill?

Mr. KLEBERG. The amendment consists of adding another doctor's name, who was the subject of relief in this bill. One of the doctors died after an acute attack of appendicitis while on leave of absence from the S. S. Brazos.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the committee approved this change?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes. The House passed the bill some time ago, and this doctor's name was inadvertently omitted. There was no increase in the amount.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a short statement with reference to the Black Legion and to include therein two short letters and a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this ought to go in the Appendix of the daily RECORD.

THE BLACK LEGION AND THE NEW DEAL

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute, and to read two short letters and a telegram.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to speak for one-half minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the disclosures showing the activities of the Black Legion in Michigan are startling, but, analyzed, it will be discovered that the horror with which those activities are viewed may be traced, in part at least, to the extremes to which they have been carried; that is, to personal violence, to floggings, to murder.

The objectives of the organization are old; that is, the collection of revenue from those to whom regalia is sold and the grasping and exercise of an arbitrary power. Nor is there anything new in the method of obtaining these objectives; that is, by threat, intimidation, and the creation of fear.

May 5 I received from Benton Harbor, in my district, from someone who was displeased because of my refusal to back the Townsend plan, which its claimed author said would give to everyone, with certain qualifications, whether he needed it or not, who was upward of 60 years of age, a pension of \$200 per month, a letter, which, referring to the Townsend committee, made, among others, the following statements:

You saps better look in glass and see if you see some green grass sprouting, as you are all going to have a green place two by six before many months unless you get doing something for the people. You better start soon or the K. K. K. boy will give you a ride, as we are not all monkeys, as you think the most people are in

your one-track mind. The big B has been looking after both old parties and they are rotten as hell and lots of us are in shape to take it in our hands to take all ——— for a ride.

I would like to punch that dirty mug of yours. * * * Seven spoke at meeting other night, and you are condemned a traitor and not fit to represent a dog house.

Yours for a fight mighty sooner than you expect.

K. K. K. MEMBER.

Don't get too many feathers in your hat, as all can be clipped or taken in a short time.

K. K. K.

Look out for the hood.

You need the limit, and I cannot say just what that will be; you are going to get a plenty of trouble brought on yourself.

In the same mail came another letter from a Townsendite, who, among other things, said:

You dirty, lazy boondoggling son of a ——— have nothing to do but go around the country trying to discredit American citizens.

You Wall Street sons of ——— are fighting for your life.

You lousy sons of a ———, I would like to meet you face to face and tell you what I think of you dirty thieves.

And there were only 163 words in this letter.

These are only samples. There are many others. The favorite sport—outdoor, indoor, summer, and winter—of some people, including a few reporters and editorial writers, seems to be jumping on Congressmen. Perhaps Congressmen should not criticize these efforts. Their authors are following what seems to be becoming a common practice—that is, the making of threats, the creating of fear, the withholding of benefits, unless certain political action is taken.

Not long ago I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of forms given to those seeking relief work, which required the applicant to disclose how he had voted, whether he had contributed to the Democratic organization, and the amount, if any, which he had contributed since a certain date. This was the Democratic practice followed in my home district, the Fourth Michigan.

However, apparently is it not local, and for evidence let me quote the following telegram and letter:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 18, 1936.

Personal.

CHARLES NELSON,

Mac Sim Bar Paper Co., Otsego, Mich.:

Our Mr. J. F. Gormeley will call on you Tuesday. Will appreciate your seeing him.

W. FORBES MORGAN,
Secretary, Democratic Committee.

MAC SIM BAR PAPER CO.,
Otsego, Mich., May 25, 1936.

HON. CLARE HOFFMAN,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: We are sending you the enclosed information which you may use as you see fit. Further explaining this matter, will say that the enclosed telegram was received on the morning of May 19, and 30 minutes later Mr. Gormeley called me on the telephone and wanted an appointment, from Kalamazoo.

Upon this request we asked him what the appointment was for, and he said he wanted us to subscribe to the Democratic campaign fund. We advised him that we didn't believe we would be interested today in making a subscription and he asked me, in a very insolent manner, what I meant by "today." I repeated the answer and he asked me if we would be interested in subscribing at a later date and we told him we did not think so.

Then he asked me, in a very nasty manner, if we wanted him to report this to Washington, that we refused to contribute to this fund. My answer was "Yes." The telephone was immediately slammed up and this ended the conversation.

If you do not care to use this information just forget about it.

Yours truly,

MAC SIM BAR PAPER CO.,
C. E. NELSON, President.

The Mac Sim Bar Paper Co. is a large, legitimate business organization, conducting its business in a legal manner and in accordance with recognized trade practices. No fault of any kind is found by anyone with the way in which it does business, so far as its management is aware.

Yet here is a telegram from W. Forbes Morgan—and, by the way, what is his relationship, if any, to the Roosevelts?—secretary of the Democratic National Committee, telling the president of that company that Mr. Morgan's Mr. Gormeley will call upon him, and Mr. Gormeley in effect telling this paper company that it had better come across with a cam-

paign contribution, and threatens that if it does not its action will be reported to Washington.

Is the Mac Sim Bar Paper Co. to be harassed by Federal agents investigating trumped-up charges?

And, after all, what is the difference between the objectives of the Black Legion and the New Deal administration?

The Black Legion wants its way at all costs. Apparently it wants money. It enforces its will by intimidation.

The New Deal is always grasping for power. It is continually taking the funds of one class of citizens and giving them to another. Common knowledge, as well as the decisions of the Supreme Court, establishes this.

Here we are in a campaign year. Those seeking their share of public funds appropriated for relief, and to which they are entitled, are required to give allegiance to the Democratic Party before they can get it.

Here is a telegram from the secretary of the Democratic National Committee arranging for an appointment for his agent to meet the head of a business concern, and that agent informs the president of the business concern that if he does not, in common parlance, "come across" he will be reported to Washington—a threat, an attempt to intimidate, to create fear.

The secretary of the Democratic National Committee cannot, like the hooded legion, beat up on the Mac Sim Bar Paper Co., but he can issue threats, vague and uncertain, as to what will happen if his wishes are not followed.

If my conclusions seem farfetched, read Macfadden in Liberty. Read Senator DICKINSON in the same magazine. Read George N. Peek, former Triple A Administrator, in the Saturday Evening Post. Read almost any national newspaper or magazine.

By all means, let the authorities clean up the Black Legion. And, while it is being done, let the New Deal set its own house in order.

INVESTIGATION OF CHARGES AFFECTING THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received by me from the Secretary of Commerce and a copy of my letter to him.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following correspondence with the Secretary of Commerce:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, May 27, 1936.

Hon. VITO MARCANTONIO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I desire to refer to the matter of the statements of the seamen which you transmitted to me with your letter of April 29. At that time we had in mind the appointment of a special committee for the purpose of making a careful and thorough investigation of the allegations contained in the statements. It was thought that the committee to be selected should be along the lines of the proposed Marine Casualty Investigating Committee, provided for in H. R. 8599, then in the final stages of passage in Congress. However, prior to the enactment of that legislation, Senator COPELAND, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, appointed a special subcommittee for the purpose of making investigations into various charges affecting the merchant marine, and inasmuch as such an investigation by the Senate committee would necessarily duplicate and overlap any investigation which might be made by the special committee that we had in mind, it was believed that in the interest of economy and expedition of these matters, that they should be handled by the same committee.

Furthermore, Chairman COPELAND's committee will look into certain claims presented by ship operators and it would appear quite desirable that in order that his committee may develop the entire picture as a whole, the committee should also examine into the allegations made by the seamen.

This arrangement having met with the approval of Chairman COPELAND and officials of the Department of Commerce, we are turning over the statements of the seamen to Chairman COPELAND, by whom I am confident a thorough and comprehensive investigation will be conducted.

Very sincerely,

DANIEL C. ROPER,
Secretary of Commerce.

Copy of letter sent by Congressman MARCANTONIO to Hon. Daniel C. Roper, Secretary of Commerce, in answer to Mr. Roper's letter sent to the Congressman, May 27, 1936:

MAY 27, 1936.

Hon. DANIEL C. ROPER,
Secretary of Commerce, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have before me your letter of the 27th instant in which you advise me that the memorandum containing serious charges of lack of safety at sea submitted by the striking seamen of New York City has been turned over to the committee appointed by Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND for a "thorough and comprehensive investigation."

It is most unfortunate that these charges have been turned over to this committee. The striking seamen have no faith in the committee appointed by Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND. The so-called representatives of labor on that committee are Mr. David Grange, Mr. John Bley, and Mr. Paul Sharenberg. These gentlemen are not truly representative of labor. Furthermore, their records of opposition to the striking seamen who have presented these charges to you and at your request disqualify them to sit as impartial judges of these charges.

Mr. Bley's strong-armed tactics against seamen are well known. He is completely out of harmony with the principles for which these men are striking. Mr. Sharenberg was expelled from his own local by an overwhelming vote. His expulsion disqualifies him from sitting as a representative of labor. Mr. David Grange has been repeatedly repudiated by the rank and file of his own union. He was one of the officials who signed an agreement with shipowners after a similar agreement had been rejected by an overwhelming vote of five to one by the seamen at a referendum. Despite this decision on the part of the seamen, Mr. Grange and his colleagues arbitrarily signed a similar agreement with the shipowners. Only several weeks ago Mr. Grange sought to enjoin these seamen who have presented these charges to you from striking. The character of the testimony presented by Mr. Grange was so repulsive that even Mr. Grange's attorneys were compelled to withdraw the application in the midst of the trial. How can Mr. Grange sit as an impartial judge and pass with fairness on the charges made by these same seamen whom he has fought for the past 3 months?

In view of the character of the so-called labor personnel of this committee, it is obvious that the charges presented to you cannot receive a thorough and comprehensive investigation at their hands.

Furthermore, on April 2 you informed me as follows:

"With reference to the conference held yesterday with you and a group of seamen, headed by Mr. Curran of New York, I am anxious to immediately take proper action on any and all matters affecting safety of life at sea. I hope, therefore, you may be able to furnish me the memorandum promised."

On April 28 I submitted this memorandum, composed of 110 statements signed by the seamen. On the same day you acknowledged receipt of this memorandum. You will also recall that at the meeting held before you on April 21 you promised to conduct a thorough investigation of this matter. In view of the so-called labor personnel of the committee appointed by Senator ROYAL S. COPELAND, in view of the seriousness of the charges made by the seamen, in view of your promise to investigate these charges, I submit that turning these charges over to this committee is tantamount to ordinary "buck passing." The responsibility "to immediately take proper action on any and all matters affecting safety at sea", and these words are your own, rests with you and your department. In my opinion, the transfer of these charges to this committee evades this responsibility. I must, therefore, strongly urge that you carry out the promise made by you to these seamen and that you conduct a fair and impartial investigation of these charges.

Very truly yours,

VITO MARCANTONIO.

MILITARY EXPENDITURES AROUND SAN ANTONIO, TEX., AND WHAT IT MEANS

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from the Secretary of War together with a few complimentary remarks which I may make about the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

SAN ANTONIO'S GREAT MILITARY CENTER

Mr. MAVERICK. Mr. Speaker, I have frequently mentioned the fact that I represent the county of Bexar, State of Texas, in which is located San Antonio, Tex.; and in my district is the greatest military center in America.

We have numerous air fields and depots, quartermaster depots, old Fort Sam Houston, a great arsenal, and tactical grounds.

In the upkeep of these posts and the continuation of efficient service to the Nation, I have constantly cooperated

with the Secretary of War, who tells me that the War Department appreciates "your deep interest in the Army and your efforts in its behalf." He says that the results obtained are best evidenced by the sums of money expended by and for the Army in and near San Antonio to the lasting good not only of national defense but of the community as well.

LETTER OF SECRETARY OF WAR

The full letter of the Secretary of War is as follows:

MAY 26, 1936.

HON. MAURY MAVERICK,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MAVERICK: In reply to your letter of May 7, 1936, wherein you request information about Army properties and expenditures at San Antonio, Tex., the following data has been prepared:

WAR DEPARTMENT PROPERTIES NEAR SAN ANTONIO

a. Résumé of War Department properties in and near San Antonio, Tex., their value, etc.:

Name	Acreage	Land value, 1929	Buildings and improvements, replacement value	Total value
Brooks Field.....	954.27	\$476,750.00	\$1,357,720	\$1,834,470.00
Kelly Field.....	2,656.09	646,187.00	1,784,210	2,430,397.00
Normoye quartermaster depot.....	88.12	50,400.00	2,353,724	2,404,124.00
Randolph Field.....	2,318.79	579,697.50	11,172,036	11,751,733.50
Fort Sam Houston.....	3,270.53	3,607,982.50	13,936,992	17,544,974.50
San Antonio air depot.....	423.59	(?)	954,553	954,553.00
San Antonio Arsenal.....	19.65	750,000.00	1,825,000	2,575,000.00
Leon Springs.....	21,516.54	(?)	(?)	(?)
San Antonio National Cemetery.....	67.74	25,821.00	74,180	100,001.00
Total.....	31,615.62	6,136,838.00	33,458,415	39,595,253.00

¹ Included in Kelly Field.

² Included in San Antonio Arsenal.

AMOUNT ANNUALLY SPENT IN SAN ANTONIO

b. The amount annually spent by the Government through the War Department agencies at San Antonio covers such items as pay, subsistence, fuel, repairs, upkeep, etc. The total of all such expenditures for an average normal year is approximately \$19,500,000. This amount includes expenditures at all of the stations listed above. During the past year, however, the expenditures were approximately \$17,000,000 more than the above figure, or a total of \$36,500,000, due to C. C. C. and relief expenditures. These figures are as close and reasonably accurate estimates as can be made within a short period of time.

RECENT BUILDING EXPENSE

c. The following table shows the amounts spent each year since 1932 on buildings and extraordinary expenses, including fuel, light, power, operating supplies, maintenance, and repair of buildings and structures and new construction:

Station	1932	1933	1934	1935	1936
Brooks Field.....	\$72,018	\$55,280.00	\$56,864	\$52,133	\$208,505
Kelly Field.....	123,310	97,159.00	231,402	46,636	583,845
Normoye quartermaster depot.....	40,818	41,613.00	36,623	23,337	83,218
Randolph Field.....	506,668	542,387.07	1,488,147	163,783	147,567
Fort Sam Houston.....	894,187	851,186.00	3,795,155	2,500,416	403,916
San Antonio:					
Air depot.....	434,740	241,137.00	176,751	75,154	211,804
Arsenal.....	151,860	148,789.00	148,579	149,081	185,000
National cemetery...	5,242	4,612.00	3,952	12,508	9,418

Totals spent for buildings and extraordinary expenses:

1932.....	\$2,228,843.00
1933.....	1,982,163.07
1934.....	5,937,473.00
1935.....	3,023,053.00
1936.....	1,833,273.00

THE SECRETARY OF WAR SAYS

The War Department appreciates your deep interest in the Army and your efforts in its behalf. The results obtained are best evidenced by the sums of money expended by and for the Army in and near San Antonio, to the lasting good not only of the national defense but of the community as well.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) GEO. H. DERN,
Secretary of War.

Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of War, is a level-headed civilian and not a noisy militarist. He was Governor of Utah, where he delivered the goods in the most capable

manner and was selected by Mr. Roosevelt as a western Democrat of great executive ability to be Secretary of War.

Mr. Dern has constantly refused to connect himself with any move to restrict civil liberties; he did not encourage the military disaffection bill, which would have taken freedom away from the American people, and finally gave a public statement to the effect that he did not favor that character of legislation and thereby effectively killed it.

It has been a custom in this country not to get a militarist or military man to be Secretary of War, but to appoint an outstanding civilian of administrative and executive experience.

I appreciate the good will of the Secretary of War personally, and on behalf of my people.

By unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD in tabular form, precisely as issued by Military Affairs Committee, a list of the membership indicating also rank and seniority, with States:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED STATES COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS SEVENTY-FOURTH CONGRESS

John J. McSwain, South Carolina, chairman.
Lister Hill, Alabama.
Numa F. Montet, Louisiana.
Andrew J. May, Kentucky.
Ewing Thomason, Texas.
William N. Rogers, New Hampshire.
Dow W. Harter, Ohio.
Charles I. Faddis, Pennsylvania.
Clarence W. Turner, Tennessee.
Andrew Edmiston, West Virginia.
Edwin M. Schaefer, Illinois.
J. Joseph Smith, Connecticut.
Matthew J. Merritt, New York.
Maury Maverick, Texas.
Frank J. G. Dorsey, Pennsylvania.
John M. Costello, California.
J. Mark Wilcox, Florida.
Paul J. Kvale, Minnesota.
Harry C. Ransley, Pennsylvania.
Walter G. Andrews, New York.
Donald H. McLean, New Jersey.
Charles A. Plumley, Vermont.
Sam L. Collins, California.
Dewey Short, Missouri.
L. C. Arends, Illinois.
Samuel W. King, Hawaii.
Kenneth Anderson, clerk.
A. E. Sloan, assistant clerk.

THE ROBINSON-PATMAN BILL

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written by me to the Federal Trade Commission and their reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the legislation under consideration—the Robinson-Patman bill—to outlaw price discrimination and unfair trade practices, is vitally necessary to stability of business throughout the country and the maintenance of fair prices to the consumer everywhere.

For the information of the Members of the House, I include in these remarks a copy of a bill which was introduced by myself to prohibit manufacturers' special rebates, and so forth, a copy of my letter to the Federal Trade Commission and the Commission's reply thereto.

[H. R. 6246, 74th Cong., 1st sess.]

A bill to prohibit manufacturers' special rebates or discounts to chain- or branch-store organizations competing with independent retail establishments, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any manufacturer, directly or indirectly, by any special price, rebate, discount, or other device, to charge, demand, collect, or receive from any chain store or mail-order organization, or any similar or other retail sales organization, or any unit or branch thereof, which competes with independent or individual retail establishments, a lesser price for goods, wares, or merchandise than it charges, demands, collects, or receives from any other individual, partnership, association, or corporation for like goods, wares, or merchandise. Any individual, partnership, association, or corporation violating this act shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$500 nor

more than \$2,000, or by imprisonment for not less than 6 months nor more than 2 years, or both.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1935.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This office is in receipt of a number of petitions asking for certain relief, signed by a majority of representative businessmen of the important cities and towns of the First Congressional District of Idaho which I have the duty to represent.

The petition reads as follows:

"We, the undersigned, citizens of this congressional district, earnestly and respectfully petition, urge, and request you, as our Representative in the Congress, to use your best efforts in securing national legislation necessary to abolish and prohibit the nefarious discriminatory practice of manufacturers granting special secret rebates and discounts to the so-called chain stores, mail-order houses, and other syndicates operating in opposition to the independent business interests of the country, regardless of the pretext or subterfuge under which such discounts, rebates, or other special privileges and benefits may be granted."

Doubtless your Commission has information concerning trade practices which are unfair and constitute unfair competition, which the petitioners seek to have checked and eliminated. It is apparent that the practice referred to is designed to destroy and eliminate competition, with the ultimate objective of permitting profiteering by price-fixing methods, which is, to my mind, a large contributing factor in creating the present business instability and the resulting depression the country is now experiencing.

I should appreciate a report from your Commission on this matter, with any recommendations you may care to make to correct the abuses complained of.

Sincerely yours,

COMPTON I. WHITE.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, February 15, 1935.

Hon. COMPTON I. WHITE,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing in reply to your letter of February 12, setting forth petition received from citizens of your district, with respect to alleged practice of manufacturers granting rebates to chain stores, etc.

You may recall that in response to Senate Resolution 224, Seventieth Congress, first session, the Federal Trade Commission made an exhaustive investigation of the chain-store industry, and as a result of such inquiry submitted to the Senate some 33 factual reports covering various phases of the industry. A list of these reports is enclosed. The reports have been printed as Senate documents. Copies of any of these reports if available, and which may be of especial interest to you or to your constituents, will be furnished upon request.

At the conclusion of the inquiry the Commission submitted to the Senate on December 14, 1934, its final report, including conclusions and recommendations based upon the factual material theretofore reported to the Senate. This final report is now in the hands of the Public Printer and copies are expected to be available for distribution within a very short while. I have listed your name to receive a copy as soon as available.

In the meantime there is transmitted for your information an uncorrected page proof of the final report, together with separate copy in mimeographed form, of the conclusions and recommendations of the Commission. Additional copies may be had upon request. It is believed that the subject matter of the petition to which you refer in your letter of February 12 is covered by the final report and conclusions and recommendations of the Commission.

In pursuance of the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Commission is charged with the duty of preventing unfair methods of competition in commerce; by the provisions of the Clayton Anti-trust Act it is charged with the duty of preventing certain other practices, such as unlawful price discriminations, tying contracts, stock acquisitions, and interlocking directorates. The Commission is, of course, ready at all times to receive and investigate complaints of practices in alleged violation of the laws which it administers, and if your constituents desire to lay before the Commission evidence of such alleged unlawful practices, the Commission will give as prompt attention to the matter as possible.

If you care to submit the names and addresses of a limited number of your constituents who are especially interested in the subject matter, I am sure the Commission will be pleased to forward a copy of its final chain-store report when available, which report will include its conclusions and recommendations.

If additional information on the subject is desired, I shall be glad to attempt a prompt reply to your further inquiry.

Respectfully,

OTIS B. JOHNSON, Secretary.

The unfair trade practices that will be curbed by the Robinson-Patman bill go far beyond the grocery trade and extend into the merchandising of most of the necessities used on the farms and in basic industries—implements, tools,

and supplies of all kinds. In a word, trade practices that have operated to destroy competition, to be followed by price fixing after competitors have been driven out of business, creating a condition that permits a monopoly and the exaction of exorbitant and unfair prices, will upset price parity and undermine the business structure throughout the country. It is apparent that business must be rescued from this perilous situation, and I am unqualifiedly in favor of passing this bill.

ADDRESS AT THE REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION OF ILLINOIS

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech which I recently delivered.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

MR. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address delivered by me before the Republican State convention, Peoria, Ill., May 22, 1936:

We are met today in the heart of one of the great Commonwealths of the Nation to ponder the past, to take inventory of the present, and to find hope and inspiration for the future. We meet within a short distance of the very place where Abraham Lincoln, patron saint of our party, 82 years ago, defined the issues of his day, forecast the crisis that was then impending, and reaffirmed his devotion to sound moral, economic, and political principles as the only remedy to cure the malady which then afflicted our people. We meet to hear the standard bearers of our party, to dedicate ourselves to an earnest and forthright Republicanism, to pledge ourselves to harmony of spirit, purpose, and action, and to engender a crusading zeal that will insure victory to our cause in November.

In approaching this solemn task there are some fundamentals which must not be obscured. This is a crucial period. On every hand we see the strivings and hear the yearnings of a people, punch drunk from the repeated blows of a depression, who clung so fondly to the promises that were made by this administration to lead them into the Promised Land. They are beset with bewilderment and confusion. They are beset with doubts and uncertainties. They seek enlightenment and truth. Like Lincoln, they share the sentiment that if they but knew where the Nation is, and whither it is tending, they would know the better what to do.

There devolves upon the Republican Party, therefore, an educational mission such as it has scarcely ever been called upon to perform. This is an hour for dispassionate truth and common sense. This is an hour in which we must solemnly pledge ourselves to refrain from emotionalism and stick to the facts. This is an hour for careful abstinence from name calling, personalities, and invective, principles must not be sacrificed to sound and fury. Instead of emphasizing nonessentials, as in the case of the small boy who importuned the captain to stop the ship in the middle of a dangerous whirlpool because his apple had fallen overboard, we must place the emphasis on important things and think in terms of national destiny.

I am not insensible to the political philosophy that would bid us win at any price and that would have us match the promises of the administration with even greater and more glorious promises, but let us not forget that in the past we builded this Nation on the rock of enduring policies and that we can justify our high place in the history of this Nation only by thinking of the years to come as well as of the fleeting present.

As we ponder the past in order to throw light on the present, we find that but 20 years ago the Nation was plunged into a war for democracy. From that war we emerged with thousands of lives of our young soldiers sacrificed, with billions of our national wealth destroyed or loaned to foreign nations, with artificially high prices and high wages, with the industrial and agricultural structure of the Nation expanded far beyond normal needs, and a foreign trade the highest in the history of this Republic. The headache was to come afterward. No thinking person who knows how inevitable the law of compensation is could escape the conviction that someday there must be a reckoning, and that every drop of blood shed in a man-made war must one day be expiated by the living who dwell in the earth. So long as we continued to loan European nations the money with which to buy our products, so long would prosperity last. So long as our goods continued to go abroad to be paid for with our money, so long would jobs be plentiful, prices high, and the exhilaration of prosperity endure.

The crash came in 1929, and the wonder is that it did not come sooner. Our President and our party had as much to do with that collapse as did one of the sacrificial pigs with the pig-slaughter policy of the administration. But it was laid on our doorstep, together with all the ghastly distress and despair that sprang from the ensuing unemployment, price deflation, and complete collapse of morale. What a ten-strike it would be if our opponents could capitalize that despair. What a splendid political accomplishment and what a ghastly moral achievement if by clever propaganda, adequately financed, the collapse could be fastened upon the Republican Party.

What a grim and frightful deception! What matter that there was a depression in every other major nation in the world? What matter that the economic disturbances in other nations were far more aggravated than our own? What matter that the groundwork for gradual but certain recovery had already been laid by the Republican Party? Now was the time to smear the President, enthrone hate, and enshrine bitterness and sow the seed of unrest and greater despair. Thus it was that in 1932 the Democratic national executive committee moved from its seldom-used, one-room office in Washington to a palatial suite in the National Press Building under the management of a Kansas lawyer and a Washington newspaperman, fortified with \$250,000 advanced by John J. Raskob and a drawing account of \$10,000 per month. This was the instrument with which the incumbent President was to be smeared. This was the machine which with Machiavellian cleverness was to develop the psychology that we "need a change", and how well it worked in converting despair into hate and distress into bitterness is best evidenced by the results in 1932.

In its efforts it was amplified by the usual recriminations and promises that attend a national campaign. What high and grim humor there was about those lambastings of 1932. Turn the Republicans out! They have destroyed the credit of the Nation and unbalanced its Budget. They have set up commission after commission to eat out the taxpayers' substance. They have placed 15,000,000 citizens in the ranks of unemployment. They have destroyed foreign trade. They have been extravagant and wasteful. They have failed to reduce the national debt. They place property rights above human rights. They are reactionaries and Tories. They have brought the Nation to ruin and disaster. How strange! Yes; how strange that the Republican Party, after 70 years of almost uninterrupted constructive service to the country, should suddenly have completely altered its principles and policies. How strange that this same party, which saved this Nation from disunion, provided pensions for the Civil War soldiers, provided homesteads, gave the Nation its first civil-service law, and a Federal income tax, should have suddenly become so vicious, so reactionary, and so destructive. How strange that the Republican Party, which, under Theodore Roosevelt, stopped public-land frauds and saved this domain for the people, enlarged the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission to protect both the public and the railroad employees, which for the first time enforced the antitrust laws, provided compensation for injured railroad employees, and gave the Nation its first Pure Food and Drug Act, should suddenly have become so unmindful of its obligations to the Nation and to the people.

How strange that this Republican Party, which under Taft gave the Nation a postal-savings system, a parcel-post system, and withdrew power sites from public entry so they might be conserved for the people, should have suddenly become so inimical to human rights.

How strange that the Republican Party, with its leaders and its members, having brought this Nation to a high state of human freedom and prosperity, should suddenly become a party of witch doctors and Tories, a party of corporals of disaster and sergeants of despair! Such is the power of propaganda and promises hurled against a background of economic distress.

Now we have a change! Faced with a host of promises and the stern demand of the distressed to make good, the promises of the present administration began to unfold in terms of action, and, whatever might be said, let it be set down to the everlasting credit of Republicans that, unlike a Democratic Congress in 1932, which stalemated every effort of a Republican President to deal with the situation at hand, we have placed national welfare above politics and citizenship above partisanship by cooperating to the utmost to lift the Nation out of its difficulties. We have made no effort to hamstring the President. We have sought by voice and vote to help him.

And now for a peek at the record. In 1932 we were charged with having destroyed farm prices, having destroyed the farmers' foreign market, and with having maintained an extravagant Farm Board which lost millions of dollars. What has been done? A combination of Nature, agricultural adjustment, and an expenditure of one and one-half billions has raised farm prices. Nature's drought is over. The A. A. A. has been invalidated by the Supreme Court. Farm prices have been materially improved, but we expect to spend four hundred and eighty millions annually through soil-conservation work to maintain them. Meanwhile by reciprocal-trade agreements we are handing the farmers' home market over to foreign competition. Argentine corn, Canadian pork, Argentine beef, Polish rye, Canadian wheat, Australian and Danish butter, and Chinese soybeans are threatening his market and his prices. We expended the taxpayers' money to retire some of the finest Illinois land in existence from cultivation, and at the same time expend the taxpayers' funds to make additional millions of acres of western desert to bloom like the rose, and over it all we scattered the sacrificial blood of 6,000,000 little pigs and 250,000 brood sows. Where we were charged with maintaining an extravagant Farm Board, we have today a Commodity Credit Corporation, whose losses on cotton already aggregate more than \$50,000,000.

We were charged in 1932 with having brought about widespread unemployment and distress. What was done to cure it? We have spent eight hundred and sixteen millions on a glorified leaf-raking program known as the C. W. A., one and one-fourth billion on the C. C. C., two and two-thirds billions to build 24,000 P. W. A. projects, and more than a billion on W. P. A., not to speak of the funds devoted to direct relief. In 3 years we have spent \$8,500,000,000 for employment and employment relief, and, according to the American Federation of Labor's report for March 16, 1936, we still

have in excess of 12,000,000 people out of work and more than 16,000,000 on relief. Worse than all else perhaps in connection with unemployment and relief is the unrest and hysteria that spring from this condition. Long ago Isaiah wrote: "And it shall come to pass that when man is hungry, he shall fret himself, and when he frets himself he shall curse his God and his king."

We were charged with having set up unnecessary bureaus and commissions and that these must be, and would be, curtailed. Yet the record will show that, in addition to all agencies which existed when the Government was taken over in 1933, 60 new agencies have been created and 250,000 civilian employees have been added to the Government rolls, with a monthly pay roll in excess of \$125,000,000.

We were charged with running this Nation into debt. When President Wilson left office the national debt was, roughly, \$26,000,000,000. In 10 years the Republican Party had reduced it by \$10,000,000,000. On April 30, 1936, the national debt had risen to \$31,500,000,000, and the end is not yet. What more need be said to establish that today we are doing a land-office business on borrowed money and daily swelling a debt that some day must be paid off with taxes garnered from all classes of people?

We have been charged with failure to reduce governmental expenditures and heard the siren promise to reduce them by at least 25 percent. The deficit for the last 3 years approximates \$11,000,000,000. When outgo exceeds income by eleven billions, what more need be added to show that the Government's fiscal house is not only not in order today but sadly disordered?

A solemn promise was made in 1932 that a sound currency must be maintained at all hazards, yet today we have a 59-cent dollar, with no assurances that it will not be revalued up or devalued down; we have embarked on a program to purchase silver until it should be in the ratio of 1 to 3 to the gold in our monetary system. The result of that program is that we have almost ruined the monetary systems of all nations on a silver basis and driven them to a managed-currency system when we were being beguiled with the argument that the silver-purchase program would re-create foreign trade. Having purchased 900,000,000 ounces or more of silver, we find that the price is about back where it was when the program started. All this has served to create uncertainty in the minds of businessmen who must purchase stocks of raw materials in advance to keep the wheels of industry moving in order to maintain men in their jobs.

We were informed that a housing program would create jobs for craftsmen who are out of work and at the same time stimulate the durable-goods industry. After 3 years of sketchy effort and several unsuccessful starts we have no housing program on the statute books, and in most localities carpenters, bricklayers, and artisans are still unemployed. Our closest approach to housing is a few so-called low-cost housing units that look like Harvard dormitories and the noble experiment at Reedsville, W. Va., where we built 190 houses, on which we shall lose at least \$3,000 per house.

We have embarked upon a program of reform, much of which turned out to be destructive rather than constructive in purpose, with the result that business, from whence must come the jobs to absorb the unemployed, has been stricken with bewilderment and fear. What a paradox it is in the richest nation in the world that we have twenty-five billion idle dollars in the national banks, 12,000,000 pairs of idle hands, and unlimited home market, each separated from the other by a wall of fear and uncertainty, so that the Nation cannot go forward with a great surge of joyous confidence.

As we ponder this paradoxical situation, what shall we say of it, and what shall we as Republicans offer? Must we deny that any good has been accomplished in order to secure a favorable hearing from the people for our cause? I think not. Must we go farther along the road toward paternalism than the present administration and meet erratic and inconsistent policies with promises and policies that are still more erratic and inconsistent? I think not. Must we be stumped by the oft-repeated and rather beguiling question, "Are you not better off than you were in 1933?" I think not. Must we commit our party to promises that we know full well to be unsound and unworkable in order to make an effective bid for popular support? I think not.

We as a party are not only not opposed to reform but submit to the people that most of the constructive reforms that have been inscribed on the books have emanated with the Republican Party. We can, however, and must stand definitely against alleged reforms that are wholly destructive in character and which seek to tear down rather than build up.

We are not opposed to relief, realizing that self-preservation is the most impelling impulse in humankind. We are, however, opposed to the remote control of relief from Washington. We are opposed to relief which develops a bureaucracy. We are opposed to relief which in innumerable instances has been shot through with waste, extravagance, corruption, and political control. Moreover, we can be definitely committed to the administration of relief by States and localities because they can do so more sympathetically, more efficiently, and with less of the sting of charity in its administration. I submit to you as earnestly as I know how that the men and women of this Nation want work rather than relief. They want the security of jobs rather than the insecurity of made work. To the man who earns a livelihood with a paintbrush or a carpenter's saw, with a mason's trowel or on a drill press, with a plow or with a plumber's wrench, there is a future. To any man or woman who works and envisions advancement there is a future. But there is no future in relief. We would be unfair and unjust to American labor and to the future of labor if we did not place all emphasis upon the re-creating of those conditions in American

industry that will bring about reemployment and the security that goes with the job.

The social reforms which came from the Republican Party in the past are the best evidence that we have not lost our zealous interest in raising wages, eliminating child labor, and in shortening hours; but, in marching toward that objective, we need not put the Nation in a straitjacket of regimentation.

Year in and year out we have steadily affirmed to labor our support of the principle of collective bargaining. To labor we can go further than that. Today huge imports of cheap products from Japan are taking bread from the mouths of American workers. Standards of living in Japan and other nations are so low that American industry cannot compete except that our own living standards be lowered. We must set ourselves resolutely against any effort to impair that living standard, and instead give to American labor adequate guaranties of protection of his home market.

We do not decry or protest against a policy of public works to take up the slack in employment, but we do protest most vigorously against building a \$160,000,000 canal at the taxpayers' expense in the north end of Florida when such a canal is not wanted except by a few professional real-estate promoters; we protest against using the taxpayers' money to build dog pounds in Memphis and monkey cages in Mississippi; we protest against spending the taxpayers' money on a project like the Passamaquoddy in Maine, where after the expenditure of millions of dollars it now appears that the project is anything but feasible and practical. We protest against the folly of boondoggling projects that have no enduring values. We believe that there are enough useful projects in the land where the taxpayer gets a dollar in value for every dollar which is expended.

We do not and have not opposed the principle of parity for agriculture. The farmer is entitled to a square deal, to adequate prices, and to protection, but must we destroy 6,000,000 little pigs in order to achieve that parity?

We do not oppose the exercise of emergency powers when emergencies exist, but must the power of Congress be destroyed and must the civil service and merit system be destroyed in order to cope with such an emergency? In March 1933, 80 percent of all Government employees were under civil service. Today less than 60 percent have this protection, the lowest percentage in the last 30 years. It is an eloquent commentary on the ruthlessness of spoils politics. To the taxpayers it is a costly philosophy which maintains thousands in the Government service without a single regard for merit.

Nor are we insensible to the new needs which arise and must be met. Lincoln himself phrased it well when he said, "The occasion is piled high with difficulty. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew." He did not, however, say that in order to meet new needs we should destroy our whole system of government or undermine the balance of functions that has carefully preserved the rights and liberties of the citizens since the founding of the Nation.

He did not say that in meeting those needs we should ignore the Constitution or destroy the Supreme Court, or divest it of its functions. I venture the prediction that those persons who would impair the power of the Supreme Court because it rendered a decision in which they do not concur would be the first to restore its powers if their lives and their rights were in jeopardy. It is the only instrument which stands between and safeguards the rights of the citizens against abuses of executive and legislative power.

With these considerations in mind, let us then be about our business of fabricating a program that by its common sense, its soundness, and its directness will appeal to labor, to agriculture, and to business; let us express a philosophy that will appeal to the young and old, rich and poor; let us give guaranties to the voters of this great State that are not only forward-looking and humane but which will be founded on the rock of good government and be within the Constitution.

The best platform ever penned by the hand of man would be a dull and lifeless thing unless it is interpreted and supported by a virile and living organism which we call a political party. It can be translated with conviction into the consciousness of the people only by a part that is aggressive, militant, and harmonious.

With a contrite spirit, and mindful of the gravity of our task, let us stand shoulder to shoulder in the ranks of Republicanism and carry our gospel into every corner of this Commonwealth.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein an address I made under the auspices of the Jewish war veterans last Sunday in this city.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this an address by the gentleman?

Mr. HARTER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following Memorial

Day address delivered by me at Adas Israel Cemetery, Sunday, May 24, 1936, 2 p. m., under the auspices of Jewish War Veterans, Washington Post No. 58:

We meet here today to honor those who in times of our country's need were ready to make any sacrifice so that America and its democratic ideals might be perpetuated. It is a sacred privilege for me to address you at your memorial services to the soldier dead who lie in this and neighboring Jewish cemeteries.

To keep faith with those who are buried here, Memorial Day should inspire in us all a devotion to duty when danger threatens the Nation. This day has a far deeper meaning and a more solemn purpose than the celebration of military victory. The show of flags and the sound of marching feet of living comrades are not for the purpose of inspiring the coming generation toward military pomp or to create a desire for war. Those of you who endured the horrors and privations of the World War are among the last to want future wars, subjecting your children and future generations to the fearful experience through which you passed in 1917 and 1918.

Many misguided persons would have us discontinue all measures of national defense. These people rightfully believe in a lasting and enduring world peace, but the methods which they pursue to accomplish this are different from those followed by we who believe that peace can only be secured and maintained through an adequate system of defense, which has been the fundamental military policy of this country since its inception. A strong and adequate Navy, a small and efficient standing Army, with these two branches supplemented in modern times by an adequate air force—the ultimate result to be obtained—peace—is the desire of every true American.

We do want to preserve for all time those institutions which are so peculiarly ours and which have been built with the genius of many races and of many people. The World War was won by the cooperation of all—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew—who worked side by side, shoulder to shoulder, to achieve victory.

To you, sprung from the loins of that people which for ages has suffered persecution and risen above it, which has preserved its integrity and its intellectual and moral greatness through hardship and cruelty unparalleled in the world's history, it is unnecessary to expatiate upon the horrors of war, its brutality, its innate inhumanity.

You have splendid traditions to preserve. The Jewish people are peace loving, but they have not hesitated nor been backward in taking up arms whenever the need arose. In every war in which our country has been engaged, the Jew, I am happy to say, enlisted cheerfully, fought gallantly, and died bravely.

In no spirit of boastful exploitation of Jewish patriotism let me mention the honor records of special heroism during the World War. More than 1,100 citations for valor were awarded to men of Jewish faith. Of these, some 700 were conferred by the American command, about 300 by the French, and 33 by the British. The Congressional Medal of Honor, which is the most highly prized of all citations issued by this Government, has been awarded to only 68 persons, 3 of these being Jewish soldiers. Our Distinguished Service Cross is worn by 150 American Jews and the French Croix de Guerre was bestowed on 174 Jews of the American Expeditionary Forces.

No account of the famous "Lost Battalion" in the Argonne Forest fails to set forth the daring and endurance of the Jewish soldiers in this gallant outfit. Recorded figures show that more than 200,000 men of Jewish faith served during the World War. Thousands made the supreme sacrifice, while many other thousands were wounded. Six hundred American Jews still lie buried in the cemeteries of France, Belgium, and England.

The Star of David is found with the cross in beautiful, everlasting marble. As they lived together, fought together, so they lie buried side by side. They gave their best, their all, to their country.

In the American Army the Jewish soldier was dependable. Those qualities which enabled his race to survive through the centuries in spite of intolerance and persecution, made him a worthy fighter in the American cause. Thank God, we live in an enlightened land, where one's right to worship as his conscience dictates is rigidly upheld.

May we always, as citizens of this great Republic, be foremost in the protection of those liberties for which our forefathers fought and which are so fully guaranteed to us under the Constitution. Let us forever banish prejudice and intolerance or any unfair or unkind practice which might arise through religious or racial differences.

The United States owes to the Jews, as it does to many groups, deep appreciation for the Jewish contributions to our arts, sciences, and material progress in nearly every line of human endeavor. May no spirit of intolerance ever blind our eyes to the debt of gratitude owing our Jewish citizens for their help in making America what it is.

So today let us honor those Jewish heroes, both living and dead, who offered themselves to this, their country. We best pay tribute to their sacrifices and their memories by loyalty to the principles for which they fought and died. These precepts are set forth with clarity and in forceful language in the preamble of the Jewish War Veterans' constitution:

"For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To maintain true allegiance to our country, to spread the doctrine of loyalty to the Government, to combat whatever tends to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free

institutions, and to encourage the doctrine of universal liberty, equal rights, and full justice to all men."

In closing, may we offer a prayer that peace on earth may soon come, bringing with it a sympathy for each other, and a tolerant spirit; an earnest desire to love our neighbor. So let us turn our eyes upon our own beloved United States and determine to build up and preserve here the freedom, the rights, the democracy which war destroys and which peace nourishes. In this spirit, we observe Memorial Day, a fitting tribute to those who have served our country.

THOMAS MARINE RAILWAY CO., INC.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4148) for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc., with a Senate amendment thereto and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike out "Lighthouse Service" and insert "Quartermaster Corps."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is this bill about?

Mr. DARDEN. This is a bill that passed the House some time ago in which there was an error in connection with the name of one of the Government departments. The error was corrected when the bill passed the Senate, and it is my request to concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This merely changes the title?

Mr. DARDEN. It is not in the title of the bill. It concerns the name of a Government department in the body of the act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

INVESTIGATION OF THE CALIFORNIA SARDINE (PILCHARD) FISHING INDUSTRY

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 597) authorizing an investigation by the Bureau of Fisheries of the California sardine (pilchard) fishing industry.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am going to object to that request.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection a moment?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. LEHLBACH. This resolution is necessary as an emergency in order that a start may be made intelligently to conserve a great fishing industry which may be in danger of depletion. Action must be taken now in order to pass it in the Senate and have the Bureau of Fisheries commence the investigation. There is nothing controversial about it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why cannot the joint resolution be passed Monday just as well as now?

Mr. LEHLBACH. For the same reason, and no different reason, that it should be passed now.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield so that I may ask the gentleman from Virginia a question?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Why cannot the Bureau of Fisheries make us a report on this matter without spending \$10,000 and without such a resolution?

Mr. BLAND. Because it will require a very detailed investigation and search. There has been a considerable fight before the committee as to the possible depletion of the sardine or pilchard industry in the Pacific Ocean. The fight is between shore plants and floating plants. There have been some researches by Stanford University and the California Fish and Game Commission, and we have come to the conclusion that there ought to be an investigation by the Bureau of Fisheries. There is authorized an initial appropriation of \$10,000, and unless we can get this joint reso-

lution passed they cannot get the initial appropriation to conduct the investigation.

Mr. BLANTON. Can they not do this without getting this appropriation?

Mr. BLAND. I doubt that they can, because it covers a very broad subject.

Mr. BLANTON. On the statement of the gentleman from Virginia I shall not object, but I am going to object to every other investigation requested in this session of the Congress, and I am going to fight against making any more appropriations for investigations.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if the bill that he asks to have considered now by unanimous consent is satisfactory to the people from California who are interested in this pilchard-fishing legislation?

Mr. BLAND. I do not think it is satisfactory to them. There were two sides and you could not satisfy both sides. There was nothing that could be brought out that would be satisfactory to both of them. The committee felt it needed further information on the matter and that there ought to be a scientific investigation by the Bureau of Fisheries as to whether this important resource is being depleted or not.

Mr. MOTT. Then may I ask if there is anything controversial about the bill which you now ask to have considered and which will be considered without debate, of course?

Mr. BLAND. It has the endorsement of the members of the committee from California, Mr. WELCH and Mr. COLDEN, and also has the approval of Mr. WALLGREN, of Washington.

Mr. MOTT. I am from Oregon.

Mr. BLAND. This not alone affects California, but it is an investigation of an important resource having for its purpose to see that this resource is not depleted. There was the thought expressed that there were other floating plants coming in, and we felt that the investigation should proceed as soon as possible by an independent agency, and that this agency should be the Federal Government.

Mr. MOTT. I may say to the gentleman that Oregon is only indirectly interested in this particular matter.

Mr. BLAND. We understand that.

Mr. MOTT. And if the people from California are satisfied to have the bill considered in this way, it is all right with me, and I withdraw my objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me that if you are trying to benefit the people of the West in regard to the fishing industry, and they are not satisfied as a unit out there, they should come to an agreement while the matter is in committee and before the gentleman brings the bill before the House and asks us to spend several thousand dollars to make an investigation, and, in my opinion, there is no reason why the Bureau of Fisheries could not make this investigation now without spending \$10,000.

Mr. BLAND. There is a great deal of information to be obtained and the bill is not in the interest of California alone.

Mr. RICH. I think the matter should go over until Monday, and I therefore object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

GEORGE HUDDLESTON

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, The business of sending men to this body and keeping them here is rightfully that of the people of the several districts of the country, but we are all interested in protecting the reputation of one another when wrongfully assaulted.

Yesterday's papers carried a statement credited to one of our colleagues by his opponent to the effect that money would reelect him here.

This Member is an old-timer, one with whom we may often differ but whose sincerity we never question. He is a man of highest character, great ability, and courage, and those

of us who have served here with him for many years know that it is impossible for him to have made any such statement, for it is foreign to his nature and his life. The gentleman that I refer to is a statesman in the highest sense of the word, an ornament to the Congress and the great State from which he comes.

Mr. Speaker, there is no Member of this House whom people who toil should be prouder to honor and call their own than GEORGE HUDDLESTON, of the State of Alabama. [Applause.]

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 582, granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into the amendatory agreement executed on April 1, 1936, by the commissioners duly appointed on the part of such States, amending the original agreement entered into by such States for the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, which original agreement was consented to by Congress by Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, approved February 16, 1928, and every part and article of such amendatory agreement is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed: *Provided*, That nothing therein contained shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of such amendatory agreement; which amendatory agreement is as follows:

Whereas the States of New York and Vermont heretofore and on the 11th day of May 1927 entered into an agreement or compact, duly authorized by law, creating the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; and

Whereas the legislatures of said States have authorized their respective commissioners to enter into an agreement or compact amending said existing agreement or compact: Now, therefore,

The said States of New York and Vermont do hereby enter into the following agreement, to wit:

The agreement heretofore made between the State of New York and the State of Vermont pursuant to chapter 321 of the laws of 1927 of the State of New York, entitled "An act authorizing designated authorities in behalf of the State of New York to enter into an agreement or compact with designated authorities of the State of Vermont for the creation of the Lake Champlain bridge commission, the establishment of the Lake Champlain bridge commission, and the defining of the powers and duties of such commission and making an appropriation for such purposes", and no. 139 of the acts of 1927 of the State of Vermont, entitled "An act ratifying a proposed agreement or compact between the State of Vermont and the State of New York relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain bridge commission and providing for carrying out the provisions of said agreement or compact", as the same was amended by the agreement or compact entered into the 30th day of March 1935 by and under the authority of chapter 201 of the laws of 1933, as amended by chapter 355 of the laws of 1935 of the State of New York, and by and under the authority of no. 209 of the acts of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont of 1935, entitled "An act authorizing an agreement or compact between the State of Vermont and the State of New York to amend the existing agreement or compact between said States creating the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, in relation to the construction of a new bridge across Lake Champlain, the issuance of bonds by said commission, and providing for the payment of said bonds", approved by the Governor February 27, 1935, as amended by no. 210 of the acts of 1935 of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, approved by the Governor March 21, 1935, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following articles:

ARTICLE XXXVI

The Lake Champlain bridge commission shall have power and is hereby authorized to issue its negotiable bonds in addition to those issued prior to March 1, 1933, for the purpose of refunding its bonds issued before said date: *Provided, however*, That the aggregate principal amount of such bonds so issued to pay off and refund its bonds issued before said date shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of the bonds so retired.

ARTICLE XXXVII

Such commission shall have power and is hereby authorized to call for payment and to pay its bonds issued before March 1, 1933,

in accordance with the terms under which said bonds were issued and for such purposes to use any funds which it has or shall have in reserves and sinking fund and in investments at the time said bonds are called for payment, notwithstanding any provision heretofore set forth in this or any previous compact or agreement.

ARTICLE XXXVIII

1. The bonds issued under authority of article XXXVI shall be authorized by resolution of such commission and shall bear such date or dates, mature at such time or times, not exceeding 50 years from their respective dates, bear interest at such rate or rates, not exceeding 5 percent per annum payable semiannually, be in such denominations, be in such form, either coupon or registered, carry such registration privileges, be executed in such manner, be payable in such medium of payments, at such place or places, and be subject to such terms of redemption as such resolution or resolutions may provide. Said bonds may be sold at public or private sale for such price or prices as such commission shall determine, provided that the interest cost to maturity of the money received for any issue of said bonds shall not exceed 5 percent per annum.

2. Neither the members of such commission nor any person executing said bonds shall be liable personally on said bonds or be subject to any personal liability or accountability by reason of the issuance thereof.

3. The bonds issued under the authority of article XXXVI shall constitute a first lien upon the property, tolls, and revenues pledged to secure the bonds issued by such commission prior to March 1, 1933, and subject to the terms of any agreement made or to be made with holders of bonds issued by such commission under article XXVI of the amendments to this compact shall be a lien upon the tolls and revenues of the bridge referred to as the Rouses Point Bridge, and in accordance with subdivision 4 of article XXVI of the amendments to this compact any of such tolls and revenues which would otherwise have been payable into the State treasuries of the two States may be pledged to the payment of said bonds.

4. Said bonds shall not be a debt of the State of New York or of the State of Vermont, and neither State shall be liable thereon, nor shall they be payable out of any funds other than those of such commission.

5. Said bonds shall be exempt from taxation and are hereby made securities in which all public officers and bodies of each State and of its municipal subdivisions, all insurance companies and associations, all savings banks and savings institutions, including savings and loan associations, executors, administrators, guardians, trustees, and all other fiduciaries in each State may properly and legally invest the funds within their control.

6. Such commission shall have power, out of any funds available therefor, to purchase any bonds issued by it at a price not more than the redemption price thereof at the time of such purchase with accrued interest.

ARTICLE XXXIX

Such commission shall have the power to apply to the Congress of the United States or any department of the United States for consent or approval of this compact as amended, but in the absence of such consent by Congress and until the same shall have been secured, this compact, as amended, shall be binding upon the State of New York when ratified by it and the State of Vermont when ratified by it without the consent of Congress to cooperate for the purposes enumerated in this agreement and in the manner herein provided and for all purposes that it legally may be.

In witness whereof, by and under the authority of chapters 73 and 219 of the Laws of 1936 of the State of New York, and by and under the authority of Public Act No. 19 of the acts and resolves passed by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont at the special session 1935-36, approved by the Governor December 14, 1935, we have signed this compact or agreement, in duplicate, this 1st day of April 1936.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEQUEST OF DR. MALCOLM STORER

Mr. HIGGINS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 26, Mr. VINSON of Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, presented a concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation of Congress for a bequest of a collection of naval and other medals from the late Dr. Malcolm Storer, of Boston, Mass.

I respectfully request unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD, together with a brief sketch of the life and activities of Dr. Storer which I have prepared.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

A BRIEF SKETCH OF THE LIFE AND ACTIVITIES OF THE LATE DR. MALCOLM STORER, OF BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. HIGGINS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, at the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress an act was passed which was signed by the President July 12, 1935, authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept on behalf of the United States a bequest of certain personal property of the late Dr. Malcolm Storer, of Boston, Mass.

The bequest consisted of a valuable collection of naval and other medals, together with the sum of \$500 to be used to cover the expense of the installation of the collection as an exhibit at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md.

The collection of medals has been received at the Naval Academy and recently I made an inspection of the same, although as yet they are not fully installed. The curator, Lt. Wade DeWeese, made this interesting statement in reference to it—

This collection is unique and the arrangements I am making for its permanent exhibition may be something of an innovation in the display of medals and coins. Briefly, they will be mounted in swinging leaf stands so that both obverse and reverse sides of every medal can be seen at a glance. The manner of insertion and securing in the stands, however, as well as the medals themselves, will be of interest to all numismatists.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in connection with the acceptance of this collection we might well express not only our appreciation of the gift, but include therewith a brief sketch of the life and activities of Dr. Storer.

He was born at Milton, Mass., April 26, 1862, son of Horatio Robinson Storer and Emily Elvira (Gilmore) Storer. He died at his home in Boston, January 3, 1935. His widow and a daughter, Mrs. Edgerton B. Sawtelle of Augusta, Me., survive him.

He came from a long line of distinguished and sturdy New England ancestry, including such men as Dudley, Winthrop, Langdon, and Boyd. On the Storer branch were several distinguished physicians, mostly Harvard graduates.

Dr. Storer graduated from Harvard in 1885 and took his M. D. from the medical department in 1889. After graduation he had 15 months of medical study in Vienna and Dublin. For a time he was surgical house officer in the Massachusetts General Hospital. He began his private practice of medicine in Boston in 1891. He was an assistant and later an instructor in gynecology at the Harvard Medical School until 1923. Also he was a member of the staff at the Carney Hospital, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and at the Boston Dispensary. He was active for 30 years in many administrative positions as well as societies. He was chief of staff of the Boston Dispensary; secretary and then president of the Boston Obstetrical Society; president of the North End Diet Kitchen, which supports the food clinics for regulatory diet of the Massachusetts General Hospital. He was also on the executive committee of the Boston Medical Library and a counselor of the Harvard Medical Alumni Association. In the latter connection he made a report to the association for raising money for the medical school from the medical alumni. He was also a member of the Society for Medical Improvement of Boston, the Massachusetts Medical Society, and the American Medical Association. In medicine he was known as the author of numerous papers in the field of gynecology.

His avocation lay in the numismatic field. His search for rare medals and coins was as keen as that of the hunter for his quarry. He pursued it with success, even to distinction, alongside his medical duties, without undue interferences with the latter; so that at his death he was the most prominent member of the Boston Numismatic Society, with a very wide and thorough knowledge of his subject.

In this field he was author of a paper on Admiral Vernon Medals (1919) and of a volume entitled "Numismatics of Massachusetts" (1923) and editor of his father's *Medicina in Nummis* (1931). His most important book, the *History of Massachusetts Medals*, was published as volume 76 of the transactions of the Massachusetts Historical Society, 328 pages, with index and 38 plates. It mentions 2,300 medals.

This publication promises to establish a standard for like publications. He also wrote an article on Pine Tree Shillings and Other Colonial Money, October 1929, in *Old Time New England*. He was, besides, entrusted with the care of important numismatic collections in the Boston region. He had made for himself a considerable collection of naval medals; this collection has come, very properly, to the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis. He was curator of the collection of medical medals presented by his father to the Boston Medical Library, of the coins and medals at the Massachusetts Historical Society, and was honorary keeper of coins at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts. In addition, he belonged to the American Numismatic Society and to the American Numismatic Association.

He was also a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society and of its council from 1925; and a vice president of the Bunker Hill Monument Association and the Naval History Society.

His clubs were the old Puritan, the St. Botolph, the Odd Volumes, and the Harvard Club, all of Boston; also the Harvard Club of Rhode Island.

He was well read, had a retentive memory, and a command of French, German, Spanish, and Italian. His command of English was excellent. All this qualified him as a reader to pass upon books for the Boston Public Library.

During the World War he was signed up in the Volunteer Medical Reserve, but was not called for active service. He felt the needs of the situation, however, and, long before the United States declared war and later, he worked very steadily for over 3 years in charge of the supplies for the American Fund for French Wounded and Italian Relief. A few years before he died, he wrote, *What a Fine Thing Life Is*.

THE INDEPENDENT MERCHANT, THE INDIVIDUAL MAN, AND THE COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRAY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, there is a moral, a lesson to be read from the history of the growth and development of the organized communities of the country, how all grew up and clustered around the independent pioneer merchant in the spirit of individual enterprise, and flowered into the village, town, and county seat. First came the merchant in the early days, with his store of supplies for the people, his store building crude, but a nucleus around which clustered homes, mills, shops, and dwellings. Then came the school for the children, then the church for religious worship, then the cemetery for the sacred dead, until organized community life was complete.

THE MERCHANT-LED COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION

In all of these public or community steps taken, the merchant was the prime mover, whether to build a schoolhouse or a church or plan a diagram for a cemetery, the merchant led the movement. He made his storeroom the town hall. He took part in the affairs of all the people.

The merchant grew up with his customers, with their full knowledge and confidence in him. His business developed with their business. His interest was identical with their welfare. He prospered as they prospered. He suffered with their misfortunes, and he rejoiced with their bounty and abundance. The people came to the merchant to exchange, trade, and buy their supplies, to cash checks, orders, or to borrow money, or to ask and be assured of credit until their first crops were made, or the goods in the making were sold. This confidence and good will were equal and assuring.

Wherever the pioneer merchant opened his store enterprise and industry sprang to life, like the touch of a magic hand, and the spirit of cooperation and good will cemented the ties between neighbors and made the community growth and development permanent, continuing, and enduring.

THE COMMUNITY FAMILY

There is something beautiful, inspiring, in the organized country community, with its stores, shops, and business affairs; with its high schools and auditoriums; with its church spires and well-kept cemeteries, all standing out in the atmosphere of neighborhood friendship and good will.

There is something hopeful, looking forward, in the peals of the school bells blending with the voices of many children, and the church spires pointing heavenward, their chimes ringing out on the clear Sabbath morning calling the community family to worship in grateful recognition of bountiful nature.

There is something beautiful and sacred in the doors of stores and shops closing on the death of a neighbor in the community, the saw and hammer laid aside and businesses suspended, the reapers silent, standing idle in the field, as the people gather in the churchyard for the funeral, as the bell tolls the hour.

There is something touching to the human heart to witness the concourse of friends and neighbors silently and solemnly wending their way from the church or the community chapel to the cemetery for the rites of burial, in recognition of the solemnity of death, and standing at the grave with bowed heads in solemn, impressive respect for the departed.

PASSING WITH THE INDEPENDENT MERCHANT

But this is all passing or due to pass with the going of the independent merchant and the community retail store, around which the community grew up and clustered like a flowering plant or vine upon and around the trunk and branches of a sturdy tree and then falling, perishing and dying with the death, decay, and fall of the tree.

To say nothing of other individual men who have been driven from their independent business to become dependent clerks or employees, 300,000 independent merchants have been driven from their counters and stores and 500,000 more are due to follow to live in dependency and a precarious existence.

Under the tyranny of a few brokers and manipulators compelling certain discounts and rebates, manufacturers and wholesale houses are being coerced to make sale and price discriminations favoring chain-store corporations and against the independent merchants. Under the withering blight of unfair discrimination, the independent merchants are driven out to become wavering, dependent clerks assured of a place only from day to day, with little to work or hope for and with less to defend and fight for.

LIKE A BANQUET HALL DESERTED

The independent merchants' homes are being closed and are ultimately to be deserted. Their seats in the church are empty. Their children are not in the schools. The cash proceeds from retail sales are no longer left in the local bank, but are in drafts fleeing in the mails to an unknown owner in some far-away city.

As the community grew up and developed, clustering around the local retail store, so the glory of the community is to fade with the passing of the independent merchant, and in time will be left as sad and silent as a banquet hall deserted.

It is a damning charge and indictment against Congress and many administrations that the Government has been left standing by while the vandals of industry have been tearing down and destroying the organization of community life for sordid profit and gain.

THE INDIVIDUAL MAN

But there is something more vital, something more basic, substantial, fundamental, involved in this bill to safeguard economic justice, to safeguard the independent merchant, and assure him of equal industrial opportunity. Something more than secret prices, secret rebates, and secret discriminations to monopolize the retail trade of the people. It is the problem of maintaining and upholding the independent

character and stability of the individual man. The cause for this legislation reaches back farther than the individual and the community. It goes back to the stability of the Nation, to the preservation and security of our free institutions.

It is the individual man who makes up and gives character to the organized communities of the country. It is the character of the organized communities that makes up and gives strength to the State, and in turn the strength and character of the State that gives stability to the Nation.

THE STABILITY OF THE NATION

Our whole political or fundamental structure is based upon and founded upon the independent character and stability of the individual man, reaching up from the community through the powers and processes of the State and giving stability to the Nation. Without such independence of the individual, our institutions of peace and civil life would be as wavering and unstable as the house built upon the sand, when the winds blow and the rains descend, in the storms of disorder and revolution.

THE GIBRALTAR OF THE STATE

In granting the general right of suffrage and placing the ballot in the hands of the people, and in laying the foundations of our political or governmental house, our forefathers recognized this basic, fundamental principle and rested all upon the individual man and made him the strength of the State, the bulwark, the Gibraltar of the Nation.

And the Constitution was framed and declared to uphold, maintain, and safeguard the independent character and stability of the individual man, holding and exercising the power of the ballot, all to guarantee, maintain, and vindicate the endurance, strength, and stability of our systems of free institutions.

WHAT OUR FOREFATHERS FAILED TO REALIZE

But our forefathers in that early day could not realize, foretell, foresee, the new and changed economic conditions coming, the growth of great corporations, the superpower, coercion, and tyranny of the artificial man created by law and the concentration of great wealth in the hands of a certain, special few.

Our forefathers did not and could not realize that the equal rights and opportunities, the independent character and stability of the individual man of the population included more than his political and religious rights, more than his personal and civil rights to maintain which the Constitution was written and declared.

Our forefathers overlooked and failed to safeguard the economic rights of the people, the business and industrial rights of the people, the equal right and opportunity of men to labor upon the earth to live, their right to pursue their trade and calling, free without discrimination against them.

And by reason of such oversight and failure, the individual man was left subjected to economic and industrial slavery and under which new and changed conditions, the superpower of great corporations, he has been driven from his trade and avocation, denied the right to labor, and reduced to dependency.

ANTITRUST LAWS TO SUPPLEMENT THE CONSTITUTION

And it was left to this day and generation, in the face of stern realities and the bitter experience of time, to safeguard the individual rights of man, his equal economic and industrial rights, by the enactment of antitrust laws against monopolies in restraint of trade.

It was because of this oversight and failure to safeguard economic and business rights, the equal industrial opportunities of the masses, under the provisions of the Constitution adopted, that the Sherman antitrust law was enacted. And it was because of the failure of the administration and enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law, to remedy economic evils and safeguard the people, that the Clayton amendments were passed to supplement and strengthen its provisions.

And now we have considered another law to further amend and strengthen the antitrust laws, as the third attempt to

restrain monopoly, and if enacted will mark an epoch in the long struggle of the masses for economic and industrial freedom.

ALL DEPENDENT UPON ECONOMIC SECURITY

Time and experience have proven that until men are safeguarded in their economic rights, in their business and industrial rights, they cannot claim, assert, or enjoy their political and religious rights, their personal and civil rights, guaranteed to them under the Constitution.

Man, by nature born free, awoke to consciousness of his being only to find himself in slavery and shackled with the chains of bondage, in slavery under slave drivers and taskmasters, in slavery under kings and despotic rulers. Man, awakening to consciousness of his being, found himself confined and held like in a prison surrounded by inner and outer walls, all of which he must scale and overcome before he could win and enjoy his freedom.

Men fought for thousands of years to scale the first wall of their imprisonment—the wall of physical slavery under slave drivers and taskmasters—but which he overcame and scaled only to find himself still within the prison walls.

THE PRISON WALLS OF SLAVERY

Men battled their way for thousands of years to scale the second wall of their prison, political slavery under kings and despotic rulers, but only to find themselves still in prison without the enjoyment of their physical freedom which they had scaled the wall to overcome.

Now men are battling their way to scale the last wall of their imprisonment, the wall of economic and industrial slavery, and when they have won this last struggle and when they have scaled this last prison wall overcoming economic slavery and the tyrants of monopoly, they can then, and only then, enjoy their political freedom; they can then, and only then, enjoy their physical freedom; they can then, and only then, enjoy their religious freedom and the fruits of the other victories won. They will have at last won the freedom into which by nature they were born, and from which they have been held in slavery, shackled in bondage dating back beyond the pyramids.

A CRUEL AND RELENTLESS MONOPOLY

None of the combinations in restraint of trade which up to this time have challenged and defied the power and processes of State and Nation has ever rivaled in magnitude nor operated with more far-reaching power than these secret chain-store corporations. Other combinations defying competition have directly affected only certain classes of people or certain lines of commodities or services upon which they levied tribute and profited and took from a part of the people only or burdened only a part of the necessities.

But this secret trade pact or industrial conspiracy is organized to reach out and touch with its withering, blighting hand every man, woman, and child dependent for food and clothing and the absolute necessities of life used in their everyday life.

HOW INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS ARE DRIVEN OUT

Under these gross, unfair, and criminal discriminations the chain-store corporations are enabled to sell to the people and consumers at a price lower than the price which the independent retail merchants under the unfair discrimination against them are allowed to buy in bulk at wholesale. It is in this secret and cruel way that these conspiring bankers and brokers behind and supporting the chain-store corporations are driving the independent merchants from the field of the retail trade and enthroning monopoly complete over the people.

A MERE HANDFUL OF MEN ENSLAVING THE MULTITUDE

The hearings held on this bill to outlaw sale discriminations shows that a mere handful of speculative bankers and brokers in three congressional districts in New York City are deliberately operating under a conspiracy to drive out the independent merchants and monopolize the retail trade of the country.

The hearings and inquiries held on this bill to prevent unfair wholesale practices reveals a remarkable secret trade pact of manipulating bankers and brokers operating only within a few blocks in a single city, but reaching out to every community in the land to paralyze competition in the retail trade.

By their system of secret trade operations, manufacturers and commodity sellers at wholesale have been and are being coerced, intimidated, bribed, and terrorized to make different prices to different buyers, low prices to chain-store corporations, and higher prices to independent merchants.

THE OBJECT OF THE LAW

This bill is to prevent discrimination in prices between chain-store corporations and the independent merchants and to relieve manufacturers and wholesalers from coercion and compel sales to independent merchants at the same wholesale price as sales to the chain-store corporations.

But we are told that this will operate to prevent chain stores from making low prices to consumers. It will not prevent such low prices, but it will make possible and compel the same wholesale price to independent merchants and enable the independent merchants to make the same low prices to their consumers, and this will make lower prices to all.

The secret rebates and unlawful discriminations in favor of chain-store corporations and against the independent merchants assuming consideration and concern for the consumers are always upheld and defended upon the ground of giving low prices to the people. But it is the history of all monopolies gained under pretense of serving the consumers that as soon as a monopoly is complete and assured and all independent competition is eliminated and out of the way prices will be raised back and kept higher.

THE LOBBY STRATEGY

In the execution of the plan and strategy to gain the object of the conspiracy organized, no means, methods, or course of dealing is too unscrupulous, dishonest, or unfair to be resorted to for the purpose. They include bribery and coercion and the corruption of public officials. This is not a mere suspicion or surmise, or a groundless charge of accusation. It is frankly and brazenly admitted and is pointed to with indifference and in defiance of the efforts made to curb and restrict their unlawful monopoly operations. This admission was made and appears in the evidence before the chain-store lobby hearings conducted by the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, August 9, 1935, in Washington, D. C., and at the time generally shown and made public in the press reporting the hearings of that date.

HOW LAWS ARE MADE UNCONSTITUTIONAL

Robert W. Lyons was a chain-store lobbyist and was questioned regarding amendments offered to make legislation unconstitutional. Lyons frankly and brazenly told the committee that he would not hesitate for a moment to amend a measure to make it unconstitutional, and that he considered that practice before committees perfectly fair in opposing legislation.

This bill we are passing here today following the experience and enforcement of the Sherman antitrust law, and the Clayton amendatory act, may contain such invalid amendments and provisions which will only be known and disclosed when the attempt is made for its administration. This is not the last word in legislation to safeguard the independent merchant. It is only a step in that direction. It must be followed up with further hearings and further laws providing for penalties for the violation and disregard for antitrust laws.

THE OPPORTUNE TIME FOR MONOPOLY OPERATIONS

Of all time this is the most opportune time for monopolies to gain a foothold. It is now when the people are thrown off their guard suffering from low and insufficient incomes and straining to make their scanty means go as far as they will

to provide the necessaries of life; it is now when they will be misled to sell their birthright of free competition in industry and leave their children and posterity in bondage and economic slavery under monopoly of the retail trade.

Under the economic strain and scarcity of income the people will not be in mind to realize that their own interests and welfare and the welfare of their children will be more assured and better safeguarded under the free competition of independent merchants than under a relentless mercantile monopoly.

THE GOAL AND WHAT IS AT STAKE

If these secret rebates and discriminations are allowed to continue on into the future as they have been carried on in the past, no independent merchant can stand the strain upon him and it will be only a question of time, brief time, when he must close his store and give away to the chain-store corporations.

Monopoly has come out into the open. The struggle, the contest is on. The goal to be lost or won is free competition in the retail trade. The independent store is at stake. The organized community is at stake. The individual man is at stake. The stability of the State and Nation is at stake. We have come to the parting of the ways. There can be no compromise or hesitation. Monopoly is everywhere destroying competition. The independent retail store is passing. The independent merchants are following. The tide must be stopped and turned back or monopoly will be entrenched complete.

It is time, far overtime, that Congress resent the delusive plea of "hands off of private business", and that we arise to the emergencies of the hour to safeguard the equal rights and opportunities of the independent business man. It is time, far overtime, that we safeguard the individual man from economic tyranny and unfair discrimination, driving the independent merchant from his place in the retail trade and restore him to his former position in the community life of the people.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's desk, I be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object to inquire whether the gentleman is going to answer the question of how the rest of the country is paying for the light being furnished Tupelo by the Federal Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, after the special order of the gentleman

from New York [Mr. TABER], I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MINNESOTA PUBLIC WORKS—FEDERAL AND STATE FUNDS FOR THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT—1933-36

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the record of the Government in State work in Minnesota.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, after the adjournment of Congress I will remain in Washington for several weeks in order that I may give personal attention to Minnesota and Third Congressional District projects. For the past 3 years one of the major duties of myself and my office has been to obtain approval at Washington of numerous important and beneficial projects.

The citizens of Minnesota and the Third Congressional District are greatly interested in and vitally concerned with public works and projects. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks to include data and information on the record of State and Federal Governments in the matter of Minnesota projects, I am presenting my report on projects of all kinds for which Federal funds were obtained for Minnesota, and especially for each county of the Third Congressional District, which I represent. These counties are Anoka, Chisago, Hennepin, Isanti, and Washington.

Data included here were furnished on short notice by various Government agencies. Minor errors may have crept into some tables, and some statistics are more up to date than others.

While this information does not include all the Federal funds obtained for the Third District, it is as complete and accurate as we have been able to make it with limited time and office force.

PUBLIC WORKS ADMINISTRATION

In 1933 I voted for the act to create the Public Works Administration (p. 4373, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 26, 1933). I have supported appropriations for public works. Since that time and up to April 30, 1936, non-Federal public-works projects in the amount of \$42,949,373 had been approved for Minnesota. Of this cost the Federal Government paid \$20,867,569. Minnesota also received \$24,605,748 for Federal projects, of which no part was contributed by State or local funds. Non-Federal projects are those toward which the communities contribute a certain amount. The communities would have been unable to finance these projects without the aid of Federal funds.

Following are funds allotted for the Third Congressional District through the Public Works Administration:

Anoka County P. W. A. allotments

Docket no.	Location	P. W. A. allotment			Local funds provided	Estimated cost	Estimated average employment	Description
		Loan	Grant	Total				
W-1219.....	Anoka, Anoka County.....	-----	\$12,150	\$12,150	\$14,850	\$27,000	33	1-story brick shop; enclosing 4 porches; addition to sewage disposal to provide for efficient and economical operation.

Chisago County P. W. A. allotments

W-1130.....	Center City, Chisago County.	-----	\$13,770	\$13,770	\$16,830	\$30,600	24	Addition to grade and high school consisting of an auditorium and gymnasium to provide adequate facilities for physical education to meet State board of education requirements. Complete waterworks system to provide adequate water supply and fire protection.
W-1087.....	Chisago City.....	-----	18,197	18,197	22,241	40,438	40	
		-----	31,967	31,967	39,071	71,038	-----	

Hennepin County P. W. A. allotments

Docket no.	Location	P. W. A. allotment			Local funds provided	Estimated cost	Estimated average employment	Description
		Loan	Grant	Total				
2616	Mound	\$46,900	\$14,100	\$61,000		\$60,650	30	New well, pumping plant, elevated steel storage tank and main distributing system. Necessary for adequate fire protection.
4360	Minneapolis	1,871,600	2,797,400	4,669,000	\$6,855,157	11,524,157	1,000	Sewage collection and treatment system. To stop the discharge of raw sewage into the Mississippi River which in times of low river flow septic action occurs.
5630	do		214,400	214,400	687,600	902,000	250	Construction of modern fireproof armory. Present system of renting quarters inadequate to carry out proper program of training for National Guard Units.
W-1001	University of Minnesota		40,800	40,800	49,791	90,591	40	Fireproof concrete addition to women's gymnasium building, providing swimming pool, field house and related rooms. Present gymnasium inadequate for present enrollment. Will enlarge space for class and teacher training.
W-1045	Edina		46,899	46,899	57,320	104,219	52	Addition of 2-story brick structure to school and construction of garage for school busses. Present building overcrowded and unable to adequately handle needs of increasing student body.
W-1057	Robbinsdale		135,000	135,000	165,000	300,000	170	Construction and equipping of junior-senior high school building. Badly needed because of growing population.
W-1068	University of Minnesota		33,260	33,260	40,652	73,912	69	Addition to indoor sports building. Increased interest in athletics requires additional room.
W-1143	Hopkins		32,850	32,850	40,150	73,000	38	Construction of addition to west wing of present school building. Present school overcrowded; need additional rooms and facilities to bring it up to standards of State department of education.
W-1246	Minneapolis		34,702	34,702	42,414	77,116	106	Construction of sewers. Section of city which project is to serve has no sewerage facilities.
W-1245	do		101,250	101,250	123,750	225,000	80	Public swimming pool for which there is an urgent need to provide children of district with supervised bathing facilities.
W-1244	do		61,200	61,200	74,910	136,200	60	Construction of complete garbage destructor plant. Will eliminate nuisance of hauling garbage through streets and save haulage costs.
W-1082	St. Louis Park		122,400	122,400	149,600	272,000	150	Construction of two-story high school building containing auditorium-gymnasium, etc. Due to rapid growth of this suburb of Minneapolis it is necessary to increase the educational facilities.
W-1066	Morningside		20,080	20,080	24,540	44,620	120	Construction of sewer system and pumping plant, grading, graveling, and oiling of a road. To provide modern system for disposal of sewage by removing the danger of water contamination.
2316	Minneapolis		84,000	84,000	256,000	340,000		Dormitory.
3055	do		86,000	86,000	264,000	350,000		Gymnasium.
3121	do		9,000	9,000	26,019	35,019		Clinic building.
FEDERAL PROJECT								
FP-240	Hopkins		58,000	58,000		55,210	40	Post office.
		1,918,500	3,891,431	5,809,931	8,856,900	14,663,694		

Isanti County P. W. A. allotments

W-1055	Isanti County		\$21,735	\$21,735	\$26,565	\$48,300	39	Removal of old bridge and construction of new bridge as the heavier traffic of the present day is imperative for the maintenance of public safety.
W-1146	Cambridge, Isanti County		113,625	113,625	138,875	252,500	150	Construction of 2 cottages and colony for epileptics to care for crowded conditions of present facilities.
W-1090	Cambridge		50,850	50,850	62,150	113,000		School addition.
W-1147	do		26,100	26,100	31,900	58,000	70	Construction of warehouse and root cellar to provide needed storage space for vegetables grown on the grounds.
			212,310	212,310	259,490	471,800		

Washington County W. P. A. allotments

W-1096	St. Paul Park, Washington County		\$49,500	\$49,500	\$60,500	\$110,000	50	16-classroom school building of fireproof construction, as present building is inadequate for educational facilities.
W-1221	Stillwater		26,982	26,982	32,978	59,960	90	Extension of water mains and construction of sewage-disposal plant to provide needed additional water mains and discontinue the discharging of raw sewage into the river.
			76,482	76,482	93,478	169,960		

SOME HENNEPIN COUNTY P. W. A. PROJECTS

NORTH MINNEAPOLIS HIGH SCHOOL

North Minneapolis needs a new high school. The Minneapolis Board of Education is sponsoring the construction of a new high school for North Minneapolis. Federal funds are needed. In cooperation with North Minneapolis civic organizations and school officials, we are endeavoring to make this hope of North Minneapolis a reality. We must put an end to the overcrowded condition at North High.

ENLARGEMENT OF NORTH HIGH ATHLETIC FIELD

A project for the enlargement of the North High Athletic Field is being considered by the W. P. A. An allotment of \$6,903 has already been approved, and we are now endeavor-

ing to secure an additional, more adequate grant. I hope the W. P. A. will approve this request.

LAKE MINNETONKA AND MINNEHAHA CREEK RESTORATION APPROVED BY P. W. A. EXAMINING DIVISIONS

The most important rural Hennepin County P. W. A. project is the restoration of Lake Minnetonka and Minnehaha Creek; Minnesota Docket No. 1263. This project has been on the firing line for the past 3 years and more. I am convinced that the Minnetonka project is now at last on the road to final approval. It has been approved by the examining divisions of P. W. A.

For a long time the Lake Minnetonka project was delayed because local officials and citizens could not agree on the

method of raising the lakes. Several methods were proposed, and in my speech of January 18, 1934 (p. 894, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD), I dealt with some of these proposals.

SIX METHODS OF RAISING LAKE MINNETONKA

One method is to divert the South Fork of the Crow River (the "Little" Crow) so that the water would run by gravity flow from the Little Crow to Lake Minnetonka. Some engineers claim that sufficient water could not be obtained from this source.

A second method is to divert the Big Crow River, formed by the junction of the North Fork and the South Fork near Rockford, Minn. The water from the Big Crow would then run into Lake Sarah and Lake Independence, and finally into Lake Minnetonka, Minnehaha Creek and Falls. All three lakes would be raised by this method. It is this plan which has now been submitted to the Public Works Administration.

A third method, favored by many, is the diversion of flood waters from the Mississippi River, where there is an inexhaustible, never-failing supply of water. There is disagreement as to the point of the diversion of the necessary waters of the Mississippi River.

A fourth method is the diversion of the Minnesota River. Some experts claim that this, like the Little Crow, is not a sufficient source of water.

The fifth method is the construction of artesian wells, from which water would be pumped into the lake.

A sixth method has been suggested, whereby a large Minneapolis water main would be tapped during seasons when water usage in Minneapolis is at its minimum. This water would flow above a control dam through a large pipe line into Lake Minnetonka, and the sponsors of the project would pay the city of Minneapolis a minimum rate for a large volume of water.

BIG CROW RIVER DIVERSION APPROVED

This spring a united effort was made to secure approval of the Big Crow River diversion method, and we have made very definite progress. The Examining Divisions of P. W. A. have now approved the Crow River diversion project at Rockford and recommended a Federal grant of \$259,200. The total cost is estimated at \$576,000. The State of Minnesota is sponsoring the project. With the \$300,000,000 of public-works funds soon to be made available we hope to obtain final approval of the Lake Minnetonka project.

Lake Minnetonka is now about 4 feet below the top of Grays Bay Dam, over which it should flow. The lake has been lifted about 10½ inches by rains since last September. But we cannot depend upon rainfall. Drought will come again, and the lake must be restored by giving it a steady source of inflow. Before the drought of recent years the lake had not been as low as 3 feet below the top of Grays Bay Dam since 1890. The levels began to fall rapidly in 1928 and continued to do so through 1934, reaching a 50-year low mark of almost 6 feet 6 inches below the top of the dam during the drought of 1934. Nearly a fourth of all the water had gone from the lake at that time.

COOPERATION OF HENNEPIN COUNTY CITIZENS

We appreciate the cooperation received from citizens of Hennepin County on the Lake Minnetonka project. Palmer Holman, editor of the Wayzata Herald, A. S. Braze-man, of the Mound Pilot, and Willard Dillman of the Excelsior Record have conducted a persistent campaign in their newspapers week after week for the restoration of Minnetonka. The Minnetonka Preservation Association, the Grays Bay Improvement Association, the Rural Hennepin Civic Association, the Hennepin County Commissioners, Ben B. Moore, Edina Village Recorder, the Minneapolis Civic and Commerce Association, the Minnetonka Improvement Association, and many other citizens of Hennepin County have contributed to the progress that has so far been made on this project. They have finally brought about a united effort for one method of accomplishing the work that needs to be done, and final approval is in sight.

Personally I appreciate the confidence the good people of Hennepin County have expressed in my own efforts on the Minnetonka project. Mr. C. J. Skreen, president of the Minnetonka Preservation Association, Mound, Minn., has been kind enough to write me:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUNDEEN: Once again I want to thank you on behalf of our association and myself for the good work that you are doing in Washington, not only in behalf of our water level but other constructive legislation. We are entirely satisfied that the people at large are truly being represented by you and appreciate the honest efforts made in our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. SKREEN,

President, Minnetonka Preservation Association.

FOURTEEN-THOUSAND-DOLLAR MINNETONKA MILLS DAM PROJECT APPROVED

Last October—1935—the Public Works Administration approved project no. 5101 for a \$14,570 dam at Minnetonka Mills to control the outflow of Lake Minnetonka. We hope that the lake-raising project will also be approved and funds allotted from the \$300,000,000 soon to be made available to the Public Works Administration.

MINNEAPOLIS PRODUCERS' AND CONSUMERS' MARKET

P. W. A. project no. 1247, the Minneapolis market project, was approved after many months of hard work. For many years I have been interested in a new municipal market.

Recognizing that proper distribution facilities are necessary for farm products, the Public Works Administration approved an application for a market in Minneapolis, November 18, 1935. This project, popularly known as the Farmers and Gardeners' Market, received a Federal grant amounting to \$139,050. In addition, the applicant is furnishing, from local sources, \$169,950, a total of \$309,000.

The original market, occupying two-thirds of a city block in the downtown district of Minneapolis, is not easily accessible, and so crowded at all times during business hours that it is a menace to traffic in that portion of the city.

Most of the present facilities are occupied by commission merchants, and more than 500 farmers who come to market their products have no—or only temporary—facilities.

The new project is located at an advantageous central point near Sixth Avenue North and Lyndale on the north side, in the fourth ward, in the Third Congressional District easily accessible from every section of the city, and with little probability of traffic congestion. The new site is approximately two blocks long and a block wide. It will contain nine market sheds each more than 300 feet long and constructed of fireproof material.

In this project P. W. A. has responded to the demand for an open market where the producers of foodstuffs may sell more than \$5,000,000 worth of produce to consumers and grocers annually. For more than a generation farmers, gardeners, and consumers have urged this fine development. I am happy to know that citizens of the third and fourth wards will have a fine, convenient market shopping center within walking distance of their homes.

SUMNER FIELD HOUSING PROJECT

Project H-4201 is the famous Sumner Field housing project which is now under way. This is one of the largest housing projects in the country, located in the center of the Third Congressional District. The project was to cost \$6,000,000, but the original plans were curtailed by the Public Works Administration, and present plans are for a \$3,500,000 project. We are endeavoring to enlarge the project to its original size. Eventually more than \$6,000,000 will be expended on housing in this Third District area.

The Sumner Field housing project is bounded by Eleventh Avenue, Seventh Street, Aldrich Avenue, Eighth Avenue, Bassett Place, Sixth Avenue, and Emerson Avenue North. It will provide 2,247 rooms in 618 family units, in three-story fireproof apartments, and two-story houses and flats. There will be 112 garages and 16 stores as auxiliary buildings. Ample open space, landscaping, and playgrounds for young children will be provided. It is expected to employ 1,180 men during 1936.

EDINA-MORNINGSIDE PUBLIC-SCHOOL PROJECT

The Edina public-school project, listed as W-1045 and costing \$104,219, was approved last fall. Superintendent O. S. Glover notified me on September 16, 1935, that the project had been approved by the State P. W. A. office at St. Paul, and forwarded to Washington for final approval. We immediately contacted the Public Works Administration, and were able to notify Mr. Glover by air mail on October 1, 1935, that the project had been approved, and an allocation of \$46,899 made by the P. W. A. Approval was made public the same day. Work was provided for 52 people.

Upon receipt of our notification Superintendent Glover wrote me a letter stating:

DEAR MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you very kindly for your letter of October 1 informing us that P. W. A. project W-1045 for the construction of our addition to the Edina school had been approved on the 45-percent basis. We very much appreciate your assistance in this matter. The addition will make a very substantial school plant at Edina and take care of a badly overcrowded school.

Again thanking you, we are,
Very truly yours,

O. S. GLOVER, *Superintendent.*

I am glad to have been of some service to the good people of Edina, where our own children go to school—a real home community; and the center of every such neighborhood is the school. We are now well provided for some years ahead.

ROBBINSDALE JUNIOR-SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Mr. Edwin J. Cooper, superintendent of independent school district no. 24, Robbinsdale, Minn., notified me on August 20, 1935, that the application for a 45-percent P. W. A. grant for the Robbinsdale junior-senior high school had been transmitted to Washington by air mail on August 15, 1935. The estimated cost was \$300,000, of which \$135,000 was asked from the Federal Government through the Public Works Administration. In his letter Superintendent Cooper stated:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUNDEEN: Will you please do what you can to see that the hope and aspirations of the people of Robbinsdale are fulfilled as early as possible? We have never had a senior high school at Robbinsdale, being handicapped by the necessity of sending our pupils to Minneapolis schools, and everyone is now looking forward to having all 12 grades of school at Robbinsdale. * * * We now await a favorable reply and a maximum grant from Washington. You know best our ability, our loyalty, and your many friendships in this district. Will you do what you can to let us hear from you at an early date?

Most earnestly yours,

BOARD OF EDUCATION, INDEPENDENT

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 24,

Robbinsdale, Minn.

Per EDWIN J. COOPER, *Superintendent.*

Mr. Cooper's letter was placed before the officials of the National Emergency Council, then handling the matter, and we urged prompt approval.

We had some difficulty in securing approval of the Robbinsdale school project, for the reason that P. W. A. funds were exhausted in November 1935, leaving many valuable projects not included in the program. However, we were assured by Assistant Administrator Horatio B. Hackett on November 11 that delay in approval did not indicate rejection of the project, and that it would be given further consideration as soon as additional funds were made available. The project has now been approved and a full 45-percent grant made by the Federal Government. The Robbinsdale High School is now being built, giving employment to 170 people. We are glad to cooperate in all matters pertaining to improvement of Robbinsdale—a splendid home city, one of the very best in the Third Congressional District.

ST. LOUIS PARK HIGH SCHOOL

The St. Louis Park two-story high school building has recently been approved by the P. W. A. Final allocation of funds was made possible by the appropriation of public-works funds by Congress. I supported this appropriation.

We have been endeavoring to secure approval of this project for several months. The Examining Division of the P. W. A. approved the project this spring, and appropria-

tion of funds by Congress now makes the construction possible without further delay. The new school building will include an auditorium, gymnasium, and other features of a modern up-to-date high school, for St. Louis Park. St. Louis Park has for some time been badly in need of a new school, and we are happy to know that construction of a new school has now been made possible. Federal funds amounting to \$122,400 have been allocated, and 150 people are given employment by this project.

CAMBRIDGE EPILEPTIC COLONY

A great humanitarian purpose is being accomplished by the construction of two splendid buildings at the Cambridge Colony for Epileptics. These two additional buildings will take care of crowded conditions at the colony, one of the finest institutions in the entire United States. I was happy to have played a part in bringing about approval of this \$252,500 project which employs 150 persons. Dr. D. E. McBroom, superintendent of the Minnesota Colony for Epileptics was kind enough to write me on January 7, 1936, as follows:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LUNDEEN: Several days ago I was informed that this institution had received a Federal grant amounting to a little over \$113,000. This, of course, will mean an additional cottage, housing about 100 patients, which will help a great deal in taking care of our long waiting list.

I also understand that it is largely through your efforts that we received this grant. I want to take this opportunity to thank you for the kind interest you have taken in us and let you know we appreciate this to the utmost.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

D. E. MCBROOM, M. D., *Superintendent.*

P. W. A. PROJECTS NOT YET APPROVED

There are many valuable Third Congressional District P. W. A. projects now under consideration which have not yet been approved. We are making every effort to secure approval of these projects. Sometimes it takes months, and even years, to obtain approval. We need the cooperation of State and local government officials, organizations, and individuals in bringing pressure to bear upon the proper officials in order that these worthy projects may be started.

I will be in Washington for several weeks after the adjournment of Congress for this purpose.

In order to bring about favorable action on a public-works project, it is necessary to secure the cooperation of Senators, Representatives, and Public Works Administrator Harold L. Ickes and his staff. We have had numerous conferences with Mr. Ickes and other Public Works officials. But even more important is the interest, the letters, the wires, and the personal calls of the folks back home. The united, persistent effort of citizens directly affected by the project is the determining factor. The same is true of W. P. A. projects, under the direction of Administrator Harry L. Hopkins, at Washington, and Victor Christgau, at St. Paul.

EDINA VILLAGE COMMUNITY HALL

One project for which we are trying to secure approval is the Edina Village Community Hall, project no. 1174.

The village of Edina, a rapidly growing suburb of Minneapolis, has submitted to the Public Works Administration an application for Federal funds to construct a community building and village hall. A requested amount of \$43,636, consisting of a loan of \$24,000 and a grant of \$19,636, has not yet been approved.

There is no adequate community building of any kind and no place for village business. Records are kept in the homes of the village officers.

The new building for which funds are sought will provide an auditorium and meeting place for several village organizations, facilities for Boy Scout activities, administrative offices for village councils, and storage rooms for permanent village records.

We will continue our efforts on this project, and I am certain a real Edina community hall will be constructed.

CAMBRIDGE HIGH SCHOOL ADDITION

The Public Works Administration approved the Cambridge school addition, project W-1090, at a cost of \$113,000,

of which \$50,850 is furnished by the Federal Government. Henry L. Soderquist, attorney at law, Cambridge, Minn., wrote me in Washington on March 24, 1936, concerning additional funds for this project. We have taken up the matter with Mr. Soderquist in person, and we are now bringing pressure to bear upon the Public Works Administration in an endeavor to secure an additional allotment.

EMANUEL COHEN CENTER

The enlarging and rebuilding of Emanuel Cohen Center, located at 909 Elwood Avenue North, Minneapolis, is another worthy project which ought to be considered by P. W. A. This center is now doing most valuable social-service work among people of all nationalities. Plans are being made for this project, and we have discussed the matter with P. W. A. and Federal Housing Administration

officials. We will continue our efforts on behalf of Emanuel Cohen Center and cooperate with those who are backing the project.

MOOSE LAKE ASYLUM

A Federal grant of \$981,675 has been approved by the examining divisions of P. W. A. for the \$2,181,500 Moose Lake Insane Asylum, a great humanitarian project sponsored by the State of Minnesota. We believe funds will be made available in the near future.

OTHER P. W. A. PROJECTS OF WHICH APPROVAL IS EXPECTED

There are other Third District projects which have now been approved by the Examining Division of the Public Works Administration. Following is a list of these projects:

P. W. A. projects approved by examining divisions

Docket no.	Location	Loan	Grant	Total	Local funds provided	Estimated cost	Estimated average employment	Description
W-1179	University of Minnesota		\$123,750	\$123,750	\$151,250	\$275,000	165	Construction of adult education building. To provide a continuing program of instruction for persons engaged in professional services in State.
W-1180	do		58,590	58,590	71,410	130,000	79	Roof house addition to hospital. Present building overcrowded and lack of space for patients needing isolation or quietness.
W-1181	do		24,075	24,075	29,425	53,500	85	Fourth-floor addition to storehouse building. Necessary for efficient operation.
W-1200	Richfield		41,400	41,400	50,600	92,000	70	Addition to present school of gymnasium-auditorium and 4 classrooms. To provide facilities now lacking and to relieve overcrowded classrooms.
W-1241	Osseo		17,100	17,100	20,900	38,000	28	Addition to present high- and grade-school building of auditorium-gymnasium. Present school without facilities to provide adequate facilities for physical education.
W-1255	Minneapolis		60,855	60,855	74,145	135,000	136	Construction of school building to relieve overcrowded conditions in present building and to furnish facilities now lacking for district.
			325,770	325,770	397,730	723,500		

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

This is a picture of the Public Works Administration projects in Minnesota's Third Congressional District. The P. W. A. is under the direction of Harold L. Ickes at Washington and Capt. R. A. Radford at St. Paul. We have several other Federal agencies disbursing funds to Minnesota. One of the most important is the Works Progress Administration under the direction of Harry L. Hopkins at Washington and Victor Christgau at St. Paul. The W. P. A. is successor to the Civil Works Administration. This agency handles large numbers of projects. Its primary purpose is to give employment. It therefore approves projects which can be started quickly, will employ a large number of people, and will not take a large percentage of the funds for construction materials. Up to March 10, 1936, a total of \$26,606,501.39 Federal funds had been allocated by the Works Progress Administration for Minnesota projects.

This includes some old C. W. A. and E. R. A. projects taken over by the Works Progress Administration. There were also many C. W. A. and E. R. A. projects completed before the W. P. A. was created. We do not have a list of these completed projects. Total Federal funds received by Minnesota for both W. P. A. and P. W. A. projects are approximately as follows:

W. P. A.	\$26,606,501.39
P. W. A. (Federal projects)	24,605,748.00
P. W. A. (non-Federal projects)	20,867,569.00

Total..... 72,079,818.39
(Not including completed C. W. A. and E. R. A. projects.)

After projects are approved at Washington, it is the duty of the Works Progress Administration office in St. Paul to get the projects under way. Sometimes Federal funds are not available to complete all projects approved at Washington. However, our task at Washington is to secure approval of Works Progress Administrator Harry L. Hopkins, then the approval of the President, and finally allocation of funds by the Comptroller General. After that,

constant pressure of State, county, city, and village officials, and interested citizens of the district is necessary to put the projects into action through the State administrator's office.

Up to February 29, 1936, good teamwork secured the approval of the Washington Works Progress Administration office, the President, and the Comptroller General for hundreds of Third District projects, including the following:

Anoka County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
*496	Anoka	Cemetery improvement	2	357	\$880
497	do	Sidewalk construction	2	357	12,205
498	do	Curb construction	2	357	12,205
*1884	do	Book repair	2	570	528
*1885	do	Special survey	2	570	792
*2000	do	Park improvement	2	570	6,406
2001	do	Sewer construction	2	570	4,746
*2039	do	Park improvement	2	570	4,824
*3109	do	Street improvement	2	549	5,700
*3110	do	Courthouse	2	549	4,519
*3111	do	School repair	2	549	1,938
*3133	do	Drainage improvement	2	549	10,815
*3169	do	Drainage	2	549	24,450
*3178	do	Sewage project	2	549	18,642
4177	do	Road improvement	2	654	6,408
4377	do	Water main	2	654	2,259
*4590	do	Bridge improvement	2	654	5,543
4593	do	Road construction	2	654	14,500
4597	do	Road improvement	2	654	3,393
*4763	do	Conservation	2	641	21,762
*4804	do	Sewer improvement	2	641	1,030
*4815	do	Goods project	2	641	9,600
*4828	do	Sewer construction	2	641	1,675
4848	do	Grounds improvement	2	641	1,156
*4872	do	Flood control	2	641	1,930
*5232	do	Surveying	2	685	1,150
5397	do	Road improvement	2	770	57,540
*5674	do	Public building improvement	2	783	25,992
*5702	do	Golf course construction	2	1413	12,230
*5702	do	do	2	879	13,684
5707	do	Navigation	2	879	9,508
*5862	do	Game conservation	2	1042	12,673
6228	do	Armory improvement	2	1174	7,085

Anoka County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of
Feb. 29, 1936—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
6702	Anoka	Tax maps	2	1254	\$5,567
6793	do.	Gaging station	2	1264	4,078
6906	do.	Hot lunches	2	1334	1,056
4595	Bethel	Road construction	2	654	6,160
4596	Burns Township	Road improvement	2	654	899
*982	Centerville	School improvement	2	508	1,710
*4826	do.	Sewer construction	2	641	1,545
*6318	Centerville Township	School lunches	2	1174	1,056
*784	Columbia Heights	Road construction	2	441	3,009
*4376	do.	Book repair	2	654	660
*499	do.	Street improvement	2	1443	6,806
*499	do.	do.	2	357	10,506
*500	do.	do.	2	357	6,020
*501	do.	Sidewalk construction	2	357	1,400
*1499	do.	School-building grounds	2	480	5,009
1948	do.	Walks, curbs, and gutters	2	570	11,600
*3112	do.	Sewer construction	2	549	3,355
4375	do.	Sidewalk construction	2	854	8,125
*4876	do.	Street improvement	2	1362	7,428
*4876	do.	do.	2	641	2,450
*5873	do.	Goods project	2	1042	47,218
*6340	do.	Sewer project	2	1186	17,800
*6390	do.	Educational project	2	1199	6,472
7001	do.	Worker education	2	1439	1,085
*853	Ham Lake Township	Road improvement	2	431	3,009
4594	Ham Lake	Road construction	2	654	968
4591	do.	Road improvement	2	654	1,408
*852	Linwood Township	do.	2	431	3,009
*855	Linwood	do.	2	431	440
*4592	do.	Road construction	2	654	4,050
*854	Oak Grove Township	Road improvement	2	431	4,800
	Total				496,335

Chisago County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of
Feb. 29, 1936

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
260	Chisago	Municipal improvement	13	284	\$1,365
*518	do.	Road construction	13	357	3,378
2040	do.	Sanitary privies	13	531	16,199
4184	do.	Water conservation	13	654	264,390
*4264	do.	Book repair	13	654	1,980
*4556	do.	Bathhouse	13	641	2,834
*6411	do.	School lunches	13	1206	3,080
*6484	do.	Wood cutting	13	1206	8,635
6713	do.	Tax maps	13	1254	5,567
6848	do.	Recreational art	13	1269	7,710
*5148	Fish Lake Township	Road improvement	13	651	1,416
*775	Franconia Township	Road construction	13	441	5,178
5012	Grand Marais	Fre. St. construction	13	651	1,490
*520	Harris	Road fence	13	357	383
1075	do.	Cemetery improvement	13	477	435
*1685	do.	Road improvement	13	480	3,632
1850	do.	Road construction	13	480	6,940
*5454	Heslet Township	Road improvement	13	770	4,008
1687	Lindstrom	Municipal improvement	13	480	10,464
*788	do.	School building grounds	13	441	755
*59	do.	Water main	13	181	2,325
262	do.	Municipal improvement	13	284	1,365
1334	do.	Road construction	13	480	5,540
4627	do.	Roadside improvement	13	654	1,416
5424	do.	Athletic field improvement	13	770	1,929
*196	North Branch	do.	13	284	2,814
*521	do.	Poor farm	13	857	623
1333	do.	Swim pool	13	480	2,160
1849	do.	Street repairing	13	480	508
*1688	Rush City	Playground construction	13	480	9,120
*1688	do.	Park construction	13	1249	3,295
1689	do.	Road construction	13	480	908
1690	Rusheba Township	Road improvement	13	480	1,176
4400	Shafer	Roadside construction	13	654	1,310
4557	Shafer Township	Road improvement	13	654	1,416
1187	Stacy	Roadside improvement	13	477	1,425
2012	do.	Park development	13	570	2,352
*1539	Taylor Falls	Construction material	13	480	2,540
*132	do.	Roadside improvement	13	239	1,600
132	do.	Erosion	13	1431	3,455
1691	do.	Water main extension	13	480	762
2013	do.	School ground improvement	13	570	1,819
*451	Wyoming	Storm sewer	13	357	1,095
*519	do.	Sidewalk curb	13	857	1,158
936	do.	Swim pool	13	508	846
5033	North Branch	Landscaping	13	651	3,632
5259	do.	Road construction	13	718	1,096
1367	Princeton	Road improvement	13	480	2,004
1857	do.	Road construction	13	480	1,416

Chisago County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of
Feb. 29, 1936—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
1858	Princeton	Road construction	13	480	\$2,004
1717	Springvale Township	Road improvements	13	480	3,132
2023	Stanchfield	Swimming pool	13	570	1,764
938	Stanford Township	School building	13	508	2,204
4559	Amador Township	Road improvement	13	654	1,416
4558	Branch Township	Roadside improvement	13	654	1,416
261	Center	Municipal improvement	13	284	1,365
3115	Center City	Goods project	13	549	3,924
*4265	Center	Mapping	13	654	165
*4296	do.	Clerical	13	654	165
*4555	Center City	Road construction	13	654	2,832
*5355	do.	Sewer project	13	770	5,660
*6180	Chisago City	Education program	13	1150	2,234
130	Chisago	Recreation facilities	13	239	1,382
	Total				440,657

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington
RURAL HENNEPIN

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
6726	Hennepin	Tax map	27	1254	\$11,390
*6894	do.	Museum project	27	1308	4,431
6898	do.	Statistical survey	27	1329	1,310
*7002	do.	Professional, clerical	27	1459	13,815
*992	Hopkins	Street improvement	27	508	2,203
1268	do.	Sewer project	27	480	49,840
4414	do.	Sewer construction	27	654	7,890
*5026	do.	do.	27	651	11,375
5398	do.	Canning	27	770	5,891
6836	do.	Park improvement	27	1269	7,024
6837	do.	Fairgrounds improvement	27	1269	3,437
4571	Independence	Roadside improvement	27	654	4,309
*993	Island Park	Freight-station construction	27	508	8,231
4217	Medicine Lake	Park development	27	654	156,684
287	Medina Township	Fish conservation	27	284	6,211
279	Bloomington	Street improvement	27	284	14,084
2020	do.	Building grounds improvement	27	570	2,423
4488	Champlin	Dam construction	27	654	10,320
5504	Countrywide	Building grounds improvement	27	783	51,896
539	Crystal	Street improvement	27	357	8,075
4277	do.	do.	27	654	19,195
*4806	do.	Garage construction	27	641	3,782
277	Crono Township	Street improvement	27	884	3,448
*276	Dayton	Sidewalk improvement	27	284	6,456
3172	Edina	General salvage	27	549	12,169
4785	do.	Landscaping	27	641	9,320
4851	do.	do.	27	641	6,846
5028	do.	Sewer construction	27	651	850
5476	do.	Bridge construction	27	783	1,896
5645	do.	Street improvement	27	817	19,746
6686	Excelsior	Athletic field improvement	27	1405	14,645
*1195	Golden Valley	Street construction	27	477	14,316
4839	do.	Sewer project	27	641	13,394
5159	Hennepin	Road improvement	27	651	11,875
2937	do.	Sanitary privies	27	531	23,717
2968	do.	Weed control	27	531	2,000
5240	do.	Park improvement	27	685	503,580
5245	do.	Road improvement	27	685	274,778
*5246	do.	Roadside improvement	27	685	844,925
*5283	do.	do.	27	718	411,385
5602	do.	Mapping	27	817	55,405
*6242	do.	Armory improvement	27	1174	7,208
5706	do.	Navigation	27	879	6,656
6238	do.	Rug weaving	27	1174	19,551
*6311	do.	Recreational programs	27	1174	42,823
*6417	do.	School lunches	27	1206	16,480
6675	do.	Library improvements	27	1206	3,516
6613	do.	School lunches	27	1237	16,480
*6614	do.	Library work	27	1283	2,574
5158	do.	do.	27	1283	27,089
3147	Minnetonka Township	Road improvement	27	651	11,515
3148	Morningside	Street improvement	27	549	3,630
3149	do.	do.	27	549	861
4761	do.	Curb gutter	27	549	5,152
*6375	do.	Sidewalk construction	27	641	819
286	do.	Sanitary sewer	27	1199	21,539
*6938	Plymouth	Road improvement	27	284	3,103
6387	Plymouth Township	Sewer project	27	1802	4,593
94	Richfield	Park improvement	27	11999	1,672
284	Robbinsdale	Walk, curb, and gutter	27	239	3,171
1817	do.	Street improvement	27	284	22,497
2056	do.	Recreational facilities	27	480	15,705
*4213	do.	Forestation	27	570	11,455
*4673	do.	Street improvement	27	654	41,820
4759	do.	Sewer project	27	641	45,323
	do.	Water main	27	641	14,669

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington—Con.

RURAL HENNEPIN—continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
4786	Robbinsdale	Sewer construction	27	641	\$9,330
*5282	do	Landscaping	27	718	76,065
6264	do	do	27	1174	1,672
3132	St. Louis Park	Water main	27	549	985
152	do	do	27	239	1,734
*994	do	Street improvement	27	508	15,202
3186	do	Park development	27	1134	16,925
5029	do	do	27	651	19,569
5866	St. Paul	Statistical survey	27	1042	5,036
4871	Wayzata	Water main	27	641	2,414
Total					3,133,370

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936 (city of Minneapolis)

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
*2114	Minneapolis	Building demolition	27	570	\$29,976
*2115	do	Park development	27	570	69,560
2786	do	Street improvement	27	1206	1,328,950
*2962	do	do	27	531	902,310
*3029	do	Statistical survey	27	549	17,290
3194	do	Sidewalk construction	27	549	6,126
*3195	do	Library addition	27	549	8,959
*4129	do	School improvement	27	654	10,660
4172	do	do	27	654	15,834
4173	do	do	27	654	16,073
*4174	do	do	27	654	11,989
*4175	do	do	27	654	6,747
*4190	do	Goods project	27	654	286,445
4191	do	Road improvement	27	654	855,675
4214	do	do	27	654	17,781
4215	do	Surveying	27	654	32,862
*4216	do	Street construction	27	654	1,154,619
4233	do	Fire station improvement	27	654	71,897
*4234	do	Administration building improvement	27	654	40,250
*4235	do	Road improvement	27	654	111,905
*4236	do	Surveying	27	654	57,516
*4340	do	Bridge construction	27	654	7,824
*4411	do	School construction	27	654	2,474
*4760	do	Road improvement	27	641	18,526
4783	do	Administration building	27	641	717
4850	do	Grounds	27	641	21,125
4965	do	Roadside improvement	27	651	29,520
4966	do	Road construction	27	651	67,655
*5024	do	Clerical	27	651	3,900
5025	do	do	27	651	2,340
5027	do	Goods project	27	651	13,750
*5123	do	Road improvement	27	651	17,781
5124	do	do	27	651	22,932
5125	do	Grounds improvement	27	651	102,273
*5126	do	Dump improvement	27	651	925,643
*5155	do	Recreation project	27	651	111,320
5156	do	Retaining wall	27	651	35,054
*5157	do	Swing project	27	651	235,675
*5228	do	Vocational rehabilitation	27	685	6,105
*5237	do	Medical project	27	685	62,988
*5238	do	Clerical	27	685	7,356
*5292	do	Auditorium construction	27	770	27,030
*5364	do	Clerical	27	770	73,458
*5373	do	do	27	770	22,244
*5422	do	Experimental station	27	770	80,204
*5431	do	Street improvement	27	770	1,472,480
*5527	do	Airport improvement	27	879	78,850
*5728	do	Park improvement	27	879	65,228
*5729	do	School improvement	27	879	34,002
5733	do	Road improvement	27	879	40,944
*5735	do	Swimming pool	27	1446	13,514
5735	do	Special school construction	27	879	50,101
*5736	do	School building grounds	27	879	16,835
*5737	do	do	27	879	19,208
5738	do	School improvement	27	879	8,754
*5739	do	School building grounds	27	879	12,960
*5743	do	Bridge construction	27	879	16,845
*5748	do	School improvement	27	879	10,512
*5752	do	Clerical	27	879	23,249
*5841	do	City hall improvement	27	1042	38,469
*5863	do	Cemetery improvement	27	1042	31,524
*5876	do	Planning	27	1089	234,616
5888	do	Clerical	27	1134	14,013
*6072	do	Recreation project	27	1134	94,381
*6073	do	do	27	1134	32,868
*6100	do	Clerical work	27	1169	620
6101	do	do	27	1169	620
6102	do	do	27	1169	3,366
6103	do	Professional	27	1169	620
6104	do	Clerical work	27	1169	858
6105	do	Professional	27	1169	1,240
6106	do	do	27	1169	3,305
6107	do	Clerical work	27	1169	1,122

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936 (city of Minneapolis)—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
6108	Minneapolis	Professional	27	1169	\$4,317
6109	do	do	27	1169	1,669
6110	do	do	27	1169	620
6111	do	do	27	1169	620
6112	do	Clerical	27	1169	1,478
6113	do	Professional	27	1169	1,240
6114	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6115	do	Clerical work	27	1169	1,122
6116	do	do	27	1169	561
6117	do	Professional	27	1169	620
6118	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6119	do	Clerical	27	1169	561
6120	do	Professional	27	1169	661
6121	do	do	27	1169	620
6122	do	do	27	1169	620
6123	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6124	do	do	27	1169	4,635
6125	do	Clerical	27	1169	1,122
6126	do	Professional	27	1169	1,122
6127	do	do	27	1169	620
6128	do	do	27	1169	1,029
6129	do	do	27	1169	3,412
6130	do	Clerical	27	1169	561
6131	do	Professional	27	1169	1,240
6132	do	do	27	1169	1,122
6133	do	do	27	1169	620
6134	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6135	do	do	27	1169	620
6136	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6137	do	do	27	1169	661
6138	do	do	27	1169	1,122
6139	do	do	27	1169	539
6140	do	do	27	1169	1,122
6141	do	do	27	1169	620
6142	do	do	27	1169	1,861
6143	do	Clerical	27	1169	4,911
6144	do	do	27	1169	1,716
6145	do	do	27	1169	2,574
6146	do	do	27	1169	8,437
6147	do	do	27	1169	3,432
6148	do	do	27	1169	860
6149	do	do	27	1169	6,006
6150	do	do	27	1169	3,722
6151	do	do	27	1169	529
6152	do	do	27	1169	620
6153	do	do	27	1169	620
6154	do	do	27	1169	858
6155	do	do	27	1169	1,907
6156	do	do	27	1169	1,861
6157	do	do	27	1169	1,419
6158	do	do	27	1169	1,090
6159	do	do	27	1169	8,580
6160	do	do	27	1169	7,062
6161	do	Professional	27	1169	3,103
6162	do	do	27	1169	620
6163	do	Clerical	27	1169	1,122
6164	do	Professional	27	1169	3,339
6165	do	Clerical	27	1169	1,633
6166	do	do	27	1169	5,610
6167	do	Professional	27	1169	2,362
6168	do	Clerical	27	1169	5,049
6169	do	Professional	27	1169	620
6170	do	Clerical	27	1169	561
6171	do	do	27	1169	1,240
6172	do	do	27	1169	1,742
*6201	do	Educational project	27	1265	19,759
6201	do	do	27	1150	64,599
6219	do	Street improvement	27	1150	7,053,810
6258	do	Park improvement	27	1174	27,785
6326	do	Clerical	27	1186	12,168
6398	do	Library project	27	1199	20,270
*6518	do	City survey	27	1220	59,400
6566	do	Clerical	27	1237	6,240
6567	do	do	27	1237	12,168
*6568	do	Social service	27	1237	22,150
6572	do	Electrical survey	27	1237	13,110
6573	do	Clerical	27	1237	3,900
6586	do	do	27	1237	3,542
6679	do	Book repair	27	1264	20,400
6885	do	Clerical	27	1254	29,000
6893	do	do	27	1268	70,745
*6905	do	Government survey	27	1308	26,115
*6909	do	Sanitation	27	1329	168,251
*6920	do	Technical project	27	1344	5,373
6994	do	Clerical	27	1344	42,678
7009	do	Sewer project	27	1402	25,422
153	do	do	27	1432	18,140
*243	do	Road improvements	27	239	18,803
*244	do	do	27	284	880,000
*245	do	Sewer improvements	27	284	89,505
*278	do	Water supply	27	284	218,288
280	do	Electric utility	27	630	5,115
*282	do	Road improvements	27	284	5,375
*283	do	Street improvements	27	284	131,030
*285	do	do	27	284	441,743
*288	do	Street construction	27	284	658,217
349	do	Street improvements	27	284	326,781
*350	do	Hospital improvements	27	279	4,970
*354	do	Park improvements	27	279	2,063,565
*372	do	Library project	27	279	91,620
	do	Grounds improvement	27	630	16,902

Hennepin County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936 (city of Minneapolis)—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
*420	Minneapolis	Medical	27	344	\$165,972
538	do.	Hospital improvements	27	1389	2,927
538	do.	Hospital construction	27	357	8,275
749	do.	School improvements	27	441	2,579
794	do.	Building razing	27	441	4,337
886	do.	School improvements	27	431	6,168
*914	do.	do.	27	431	40,352
918	do.	Road improvements	27	508	15,762
*1044	do.	Library improvements	27	431	31,083
*1055	do.	Nursing project	27	508	30,600
1065	do.	Road improvements	27	477	10,421
1094	do.	Navigation improvements	27	477	5,234
1196	do.	Building grounds improvements	27	477	18,883
*1267	do.	Library improvements	27	480	25,749
*1355	do.	Clerical work	27	480	17,540
1356	do.	Water conservation	27	480	9,650
*1563	do.	Library work	27	480	7,261
*1564	do.	Park improvements	27	480	14,681
1565	do.	City hall improvements	27	480	5,312
1566	do.	Roadside improvements	27	480	23,373
*1567	do.	School sanitary systems	27	1389	2,166
1567	do.	Sanitary privies	27	480	5,365
1568	do.	Salvage	27	480	8,308
*1711	do.	Fire station	27	480	21,344
1712	do.	Building grounds improvements	27	480	20,887
*1713	do.	School building grounds	27	480	4,719
*1815	do.	Library improvements	27	480	19,869
*1879	do.	Special survey	27	570	64,397
*2098	do.	Road improvements	27	570	25,768
2099	do.	do.	27	570	29,238
*2112	do.	Culvert improvements	27	570	85,202
*2113	do.	Work, curb, gutter	27	570	73,522
Total					22,862,376

Isanti County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
*5681	Isanti	Public building	30	783	\$33,850
*454	do.	Road improvement	30	357	2,560
1363	do.	do.	30	480	2,352
2992	do.	do.	30	549	30,100
3116	do.	School-building grounds	30	549	1,795
*4526	do.	Road improvement	30	654	16,452
*5337	do.	Library project	30	770	1,980
6729	do.	Tax map	30	1254	5,567
6847	do.	Recreational art	30	1269	7,710
6276	Braham	Street improvement	30	718	870
*6432	do.	School lunches	30	1206	385
*197	Cambridge	Park development	30	284	4,654
540	do.	Street improvement	30	357	190
*1096	do.	Clerical	30	477	270
*1097	do.	Courthouse improvement	30	1283	220
1097	do.	Courthouse	30	477	110
1365	do.	Road improvement	30	480	1,989
1366	do.	do.	30	480	1,869
1572	do.	Grounds improvement	30	480	465
1716	do.	Road improvements	30	480	1,406
1935	do.	Recreational facilities	30	570	5,280
3114	do.	Goods project	30	549	2,724

W. P. A. projects in operation or authorized for work

ANOKA COUNTY

Official project no.	State serial no.	Work project no.	Description	Location	Starting date	Percent of completion to date	Estimated date of completion	Federal funds	Sponsor funds
65-71-501	6-441	596	Sidewalk	Columbia Heights	Dec. 6, 1936	0	Feb. 6, 1937	\$1,540	
65-71-2141	6-604	2873	Park improvements	do.	May 21, 1936	14	Nov. 21, 1936	39,585	\$15,238
65-71-5702	6-483	2621	Golf course	Anoka	Apr. 6, 1936	15	Jan. 6, 1937	27,282	10,040
65-71-4763	6-444	1844	Constructing buildings, game refuge	do.	Jan. 15, 1936	50	Dec. 21, 1936	23,938	8,100
65-71-3112	6-459	1694	Sewers	Columbia Heights	Jan. 21, 1936	0	Mar. 21, 1937	3,910	
65-71-1885	6-454	1268	Clerical	Anoka	Will not start	0		871	
65-71-6318	6-532	2049	Hot lunch	Centerville	Jan. 30, 1936	20	Feb. 6, 1937	1,161	320
65-71-1884	6-448	1202	Book repair	Anoka	Nov. 15, 1935	80	Sept. 6, 1936	580	15
65-71-4376	6-449	1669	do.	Columbia Heights	Nov. 30, 1935	100	June 21, 1936	726	25
65-71-5232	6-485	1212	Survey	Anoka	do.	40	Dec. 6, 1936	2,861	25
65-71-6390	6-548	2173	Recreation	Columbia Heights	Jan. 30, 1936	65	Aug. 28, 1936	7,119	
65-71-3178	6-481	910	Sewing	Anoka	Nov. 15, 1935	50	Mar. 6, 1937	20,506	650
65-71-6340	6-534	2101	do.	Columbia Heights	Jan. 15, 1936	65	Sept. 21, 1936	18,646	280

Isanti County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936—Continued

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved (Federal funds only)
4738	Cambridge	Sewing project	30	641	\$5,660
6483	do.	Wood cutting	30	1206	8,695
6539	do.	Road improvement	30	1232	915
Total					138,068

Washington County W. P. A. projects approved at Washington as of Feb. 29, 1936

Official project no.	Location	Type of project	County	Presidential no.	Project amount approved
*5108	Newport	Street improvement	82	651	\$6,499
5421	Point Douglas	Roadside improvement	82	770	24,744
4837	St. Paul Park	Building demolition	82	641	3,318
*4838	do.	Street improvement	82	641	8,996
*475	Stillwater	Road improvement	82	357	5,324
*1170	do.	Street improvement	82	477	17,700
*1171	do.	Park improvement	82	477	11,802
*1468	do.	Clerical work	82	480	9,540
*1469	do.	Public-building improvement	82	480	13,248
*1470	do.	Construction material	82	1389	11,764
1470	do.	do.	82	480	7,352
*4240	do.	Roadside improvement	82	654	25,082
*4454	do.	Sewing project	82	654	15,304
*4455	do.	Library project	82	654	21,520
5404	do.	Street improvement	82	770	22,052
*615	Washington	Road improvement	82	357	21,066
2946	do.	Sanitary privies	82	531	16,199
*6251	do.	Armory improvement	82	1174	8,582
6476	do.	Relief fuel	82	1206	9,318
6781	do.	Tax maps	82	1254	7,935
*6851	do.	Recreational program	82	1269	8,058
6947	Bayport	Street improvement	82	570	14,139
4844	Birchwood	Town hall improvement	82	641	206
5608	Denmark Township	Road improvement	82	817	5,556
*1806	Forest Lake	Street improvement	82	480	8,527
*2081	do.	Park improvement	82	570	3,148
*6214	do.	Educational program	82	1150	2,807
*2035	Marine	Roadside improvement	82	570	6,100
*2080	Hugo	Water conservation	82	570	1,731
614	Lincoln	Road improvement	82	357	7,808
*1664	Mahtomedi	Street improvement	82	480	11,304
2034	Newport	Grounds improvement	82	570	1,646
Total					338,375

W. P. A. PROJECTS IN OPERATION—THIRD CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT

On the above list we have indicated by an asterisk (*) sign which approved W. P. A. projects have been put in operation or authorized for work on a certain future date by the State administrator, Victor Christgau. It may be that by this time some projects not indicated by this sign have been put in operation. Minor clerical errors may possibly have been made, but our information is as correct and up to date as it has been possible to make it.

Victor Christgau, Works Progress Administrator for Minnesota, has furnished me with the following list of Third District W. P. A. projects which have actually been authorized for work by his office:

W. P. A. projects in operation or authorized for work—Continued
 ANOKA COUNTY—continued

Official project no.	State serial no.	Work project no.	Description	Location	Starting date	Per cent of completion to date	Estimated date of completion	Federal funds	Sponsor funds
65-71-4815	6-466	1225	Wood cutting	Anoka	Jan. 15, 1936	20	Feb. 21, 1937	\$10,560	\$2,150
65-71-5873	6-434	1884	Tanning hides	Columbia Heights	Dec. 15, 1935	60	Nov. 6, 1936	51,939	-----
65-71-5674	6-601	1648	Road construction	Anoka	Nov. 30, 1935	65	Dec. 21, 1936	28,591	-----
65-71-854	6-432	732	Road repairs	Burns and Oak Grove Townships	Nov. 15, 1935	20	Mar. 6, 1937	5,280	7,140
65-71-855	6-433	1219	do	Linwood	Dec. 6, 1936	0	Jan. 6, 1937	484	-----
65-71-4592	6-464	1683	do	do	do	0	Apr. 6, 1937	4,444	-----
65-71-784	6-429	334	do	Centerville Township	Nov. 15, 1935	33	Feb. 21, 1937	3,309	473
65-71-853	6-431	749	do	Ham Lake Township	Jan. 21, 1936	0	Apr. 21, 1937	3,309	-----
65-71-852	6-430	770	do	Linwood Township	Nov. 15, 1935	45	Feb. 21, 1937	3,309	348
65-71-499	6-459	359	Street repairs	Columbia Heights	Oct. 31, 1935	75	July 21, 1936	18,162	1,905
65-71-500	6-440	360	do	do	do	55	Sept. 21, 1936	12,370	2,565
65-71-3109	6-474	691	do	Anoka	Nov. 15, 1935	50	Oct. 21, 1936	6,270	304
65-71-4826	6-478	1204	Laying tile	Centerville	Jan. 15, 1936	85	Dec. 6, 1936	1,699	420
65-71-4872	6-468	1216	Laying concrete pipe	Anoka	Jan. 6, 1937	0	Mar. 6, 1937	2,123	-----
65-71-4590	6-462	1719	Bridge repairs	do	Dec. 6, 1936	0	Apr. 6, 1937	6,097	-----
65-71-3110	6-482	2424	Courthouse addition	do	Feb. 15, 1936	80	Aug. 6, 1936	4,970	2,711
65-71-1490	6-445	662	School repairs	Columbia Heights	Nov. 15, 1935	70	July 21, 1936	9,368	2,264
65-71-982	6-443	641	School painting	Centerville	Nov. 21, 1936	0	Jan. 21, 1937	1,881	-----
65-71-3111	6-461	778	School repairs	Anoka	do	0	Feb. 21, 1937	2,131	-----
65-71-2039	6-456	1304	Park beautification	do	Dec. 6, 1936	0	Apr. 6, 1937	5,306	-----
65-71-2000	6-450	1338	do	do	Jan. 15, 1936	75	Jan. 6, 1937	7,046	2,432
65-71-5862	6-452	2788	Power line	do	May 21, 1936	32	Mar. 6, 1937	13,940	3,351
65-71-4804	6-484	1218	Sanitary sewer	do	Jan. 21, 1937	0	Mar. 21, 1937	1,133	-----
65-71-4828	6-472	1684	Storm sewer	do	do	Completed	do	1,842	998
65-71-496	6-435	399	Cemetery repairs	do	do	do	do	968	1,362
65-71-4876	6-479	1221	Street repairs	Columbia Heights	do	do	do	10,865	355
65-71-3169	6-458	777	Clean ditches	Anoka	do	Discontinued	do	26,895	-----
65-71-3133	6-476	895	do	do	do	do	do	11,896	-----

CHISAGO COUNTY

65-71-520	2-98	576	Painting snow fence	Rush City, Center City, Harris 6.	do	Completed	do	\$421	\$508
65-71-451	2-139	2358	Storm sewer	Wyoming	do	do	do	1,204	99
65-71-4555	2-597	2256	Road construction	Center City	do	do	do	3,115	2,250
65-71-519	2-89	479	Sidewalk construction	Wyoming	July 2, 1936	45	Sept. 30, 1936	3,182	49
65-71-1688	2-374	702	Park construction	Rush City	Open	25	June 30, 1937	13,656	725
65-71-59	2-7	284	Water main	Lindstrom	do	Completed	do	2,557	343
65-71-6180	2-858	1900	Educational	Center City	Open	50	June 30, 1937	2,457	-----
65-71-4265	2-599	1515	Clerical (county maps)	do	Oct. 30, 1936	60	Dec. 30, 1936	315	-----
65-71-4266	2-600	2435	County surveyor records	do	do	Completed	do	181	-----
65-71-6411	2-830	2180	Hot lunches	do	Oct. 15, 1936	35	Apr. 30, 1937	3,388	332
65-71-4264	2-598	1560	School library book repair	do	Open	60	Dec. 30, 1936	2,178	44
65-71-5355	2-716	1564	Sewage	Lindstrom	do	50	June 30, 1937	9,751	-----
65-71-1539	2-388	2071	Sand pit	Taylor Falls	do	Completed	do	2,794	60
65-71-6484	2-842	2185	Wood cutting	Center City	do	do	do	9,553	300
65-71-5454	2-517	2258	Culverts on roads	Rush City	Dec. 28, 1936	50	Feb. 28, 1937	4,408	51
65-71-775	2-172	2334	Road repair	Franconia	Sept. 31, 1936	62	Dec. 31, 1936	5,695	260
65-71-4556	2-628	2701	do	Chisago City	Sept. 30, 1936	65	Oct. 30, 1936	1,416	49
65-71-5148	2-604	2702	do	Grandy	Sept. 15, 1936	90	Sept. 30, 1936	1,416	49
65-71-132	2-40	289	Roadside beautification	Taylor Falls	Open	50	June 30, 1937	5,215	1,808
65-71-518	2-88	1163	Road repair	County-wide	do	Completed	do	3,715	263
65-71-1886	2-372	1205	do	Harris	Oct. 1, 1936	97	Oct. 15, 1936	3,995	243
65-71-521	2-99	616	Poor farm building repair	North Branch	Open	75	July 1, 1936	685	572
65-71-788	2-173	542	School ground repair	Lindstrom	do	Completed	do	830	442
65-71-196	2-32	148	Athletic field construction	North Branch	Open	90	July 7, 1936	5,681	355
65-71-1264	2-336	2295	Repair buildings, State park	Taylor Falls	do	12	June 30, 1937	30,059	480

HENNEPIN COUNTY

65-71-2962	5-58	1767	Street repairs	Minneapolis, city-wide	Dec. 17, 1935	71	Discontinued	\$992,541	\$15,000
65-71-276	5-5	226	do	do	Oct. 14, 1935	80	August 1936	10,464	2,655
65-71-1195	5-97	608	do	Golden Valley	Nov. 6, 1935	75	December 1936	15,747	850
65-71-992	5-44	2825	do	Hopkins	Apr. 28, 1936	95	July 1936	2,428	115
65-71-5431	5-169	1733	do	Minneapolis	Nov. 26, 1935	19	Will not be completed.	1,619,728	-----
65-71-288	5-32	250	Repair of street, curb, street and traffic signs	Minneapolis, throughout city	Oct. 9, 1935	62	Nov. 1936	359,459	6,300
65-71-2113	5-111	2878	Construction of curb and sidewalks	Minneapolis	Not started	-----	Jan. 1937	80,874	4,693
65-71-5743	5-102	1773	Constructing new bridge over Minnehaha Creek	do	Dec. 19, 1935	85	July 1936	25,173	1,377
65-71-243	5-18	1076	Grading trunk Highway No. 100	Hennepin County	Oct. 31, 1935	50	November 1936	968,000	368,946
65-71-5246	5-203	2266	Grading and graveling county roads	Minneapolis	Jan. 10, 1936	30	July 1937	929,417	45,790
65-71-5123	5-164	2844	Grade road no. 17	do	Apr. 27, 1936	100	June 1936	19,559	1,100
65-71-4760	5-205	2845	Grading town roads	Minnetrista	do	35	December 1936	20,378	3,330
65-71-4235	5-163	2245	Grading county road no. 18	Minneapolis	Jan. 21, 1936	95	July 1936	235,119	21,873
65-71-283	5-23	258	Relaying wood-block pavement	do	Oct. 21, 1935	99	do	485,917	5,000
65-71-2112	5-108	1772	Installing culverts	do	Dec. 9, 1935	66	October 1936	93,722	-----
65-71-285	5-25	89	Relaying brick pavement	do	Oct. 21, 1935	85	August 1936	724,038	10,000
65-71-282	5-20	249	Relaying granite pavement	do	Oct. 17, 1935	85	do	144,133	3,000
65-71-4216	5-216	1760	Street repairs	do	Nov. 26, 1935	25	Suspended	1,270,080	15,000
65-71-994	5-92	2246	Grade and gravel streets	St. Louis Park	Jan. 13, 1936	75	August 1936	26,124	1,971
65-71-4213	5-212	2693	Street repairs	Robbinsdale	Mar. 23, 1936	85	August 1936	46,002	3,755
65-71-261	5-17	247	Roadside development	Minneapolis to Excelsior	Oct. 25, 1935	60	October 1936	121,480	46,682
65-71-5283	5-213	1718	Beautification of county road	Minneapolis	Nov. 19, 1935	60	December 1936	452,523	6,070
65-71-2098	5-107	1984	Ditching and widening county road	do	Dec. 6, 1935	75	August 1936	28,344	1,716
65-71-2115	5-114	2267	Road repair	do	Jan. 21, 1936	60	January 1937	76,516	-----
65-71-275	5-1	212	Repair concrete arch bridge	do	Oct. 7, 1935	100	Completed June 1936	12,715	7,671
65-71-4340	5-103	1867	Bridge repair at Portland and Minnehaha	do	Dec. 19, 1935	80	July 1936	12,869	592
65-71-5642	5-51	1613	Street repairs and guard rail construction	Edina Village	Dec. 11, 1935	75	November 1936	21,720	5,181
65-71-1711	5-64	1002	Repairs of fire station	Minneapolis	Nov. 7, 1935	70	Funds exhausted	23,478	4,200
65-71-5422	5-230	2603	Construction of hydraulic laboratory	do	Mar. 13, 1936	40	Oct. 1, 1936	88,224	15,000
65-71-993	5-89	1880	Construction of fire hall and community hall	Island Park	Dec. 2, 1935	60	September 1936	14,820	3,345
65-71-4806	5-204	2876	Construction of brick warehouse	Crystal	May 11, 1936	60	August 1936	4,160	1,988

W. P. A. projects in operation or authorized for work—Continued
HENNEPIN COUNTY—continued

Official project no.	State serial no.	Work project no.	Description	Location	Starting date	Percent of completion to date	Estimated date of completion	Federal funds	Sponsor funds
65-71-5841	5-56	2037	Reconstructing offices, city hall.	Minneapolis.	Dec. 23, 1935.	75	January 1937.	\$42,315	\$1,500
65-71-4235	5-77	1774	Remodeling and redecorating fire stations.	do.	Dec. 12, 1935.	60	December 1936.	79,086	5,000
65-71-4234	5-78	1776	Remodeling and redecorating engine department.	do.	do.	80	November 1936.	44,275	2,500
65-71-806	5-62	767	Painting walls, Madison School.	do.	Nov. 4, 1935.	100	Completed June 1936.	6,784	1,215
65-71-914	5-61	808	Refinishing blackboard surface, 51 schools.	do.	Nov. 12, 1935.	99	June 1936.	44,387	
65-71-1713	5-86	966	School, repair and painting.	do.	Nov. 8, 1935.	100	Completed May 1936.	5,190	946
65-71-4175	5-84	1478	do.	do.	Nov. 15, 1935.	100	do.	7,421	957
65-71-4174	5-83	1483	do.	do.	Nov. 18, 1935.	100	do.	16,018	2,454
65-71-5748	5-88	1641	do.	do.	Feb. 18, 1936.	100	do.	11,563	
65-71-5738	5-87	1642	do.	do.	Jan. 6, 1936.	100	do.	21,975	
65-71-5739	5-73	1649	do.	do.	Dec. 12, 1935.	100	Completed June 1936.	14,256	2,754
65-71-4129	5-86	1609	do.	do.	Mar. 10, 1936.	98	Completed July 1936.	11,726	
65-71-1567	5-113	981	do.	do.	Nov. 8, 1935.	98	do.	8,067	5,718
65-71-5737	5-76	1640	do.	do.	Dec. 31, 1935.	100	Completed May 1936.	26,649	3,962
65-71-5729	5-71	1643	do.	do.	Nov. 25, 1935.	100	do.	42,611	6,900
65-71-5735	5-63	2636	Construct swimming pool.	do.	Feb. 27, 1936.	55	October 1936.	68,625	1,250
65-71-2114	5-112	2600	Wrecking school building.	do.	Mar. 19, 1936.	80	August 1936.	32,975	200
65-71-1044	5-57	834	Repairs in and to main library.	do.	Nov. 5, 1935.	60	Suspended.	34,191	1,750
65-71-1815	5-80	1055	Repair and rehabilitate branch library.	do.	Nov. 12, 1935.	60	do.	32,830	2,000
65-71-1267	5-91	1098	do.	do.	do.	50	do.	35,900	975
65-71-3195	5-34	1838	Addition to Central Avenue library.	do.	Dec. 6, 1935.	95	July 1936.	13,628	1,862
65-71-5292	5-94	1810	Repairing booths, used for election.	do.	Dec. 6, 1935.	90	August 1936.	29,799	800
65-71-1777	5-65	993	Completing remodeling detention home.	do.	Nov. 4, 1935.	90	July 1936.	33,470	1,700
65-71-278	5-8	1854	Revamping boilers and electric lights.	do.	Dec. 2, 1935.	100	June 1936.	5,626	38,021
65-71-1198	5-08	617	Paint city-engineer oil plants.	do.	Nov. 15, 1935.	65	November 1936.	20,771	900
65-71-5155	5-167	1751	Maintaining recreational facilities.	do.	Nov. 22, 1935.	43	March 1937.	122,452	4,860
65-71-5504	5-208	2779	School-grounds improvements.	do.	Apr. 30, 1936.	10	November 1936.	57,085	42,357
65-71-4411	5-06	2780	do.	do.	May 4, 1936.	60	September 1936.	2,721	1,053
65-71-5728	5-109	2884	Installation of sprinkling system.	do.	do.		Not started.	71,750	8,418
65-71-350	5-26	90	Beautification of parks.	do.	Sept. 22, 1935.	75	December 1936.	2,269,921	40,500
65-71-1564	5-99	1636	Road repairs.	do.	June 8, 1936.	20	September 1936.	16,149	300
65-71-245	5-30	291	Repair and extension of waterwork project.	do.	Oct. 14, 1935.	50	February 1937.	240,116	5,750
65-71-6375	5-247	2847	Sewer construction.	do.	May 4, 1936.	2	March 1938.	23,692	24,539
65-71-5282	5-186	2125	Installation of sewers.	do.	Dec. 30, 1935.	55	February 1937.	83,671	5,002
65-71-244	5-22	292	Sewer and drain repair.	do.	Nov. 4, 1935.	80	October 1936.	98,455	3,025
S-26 U-6242	5-260	2446	Repairs and beautification of armories.	do.	Feb. 3, 1936.	95	June 1936.	7,928	796
65-71-5228	5-161	1293	Operate a project for "shut-ins".	do.	Nov. 12, 1935.	98	Suspended June 1936.	6,715	500
65-71-6201	5-246	1918	Educational.	do.	Dec. 2, 1935.	75	August 1936.	92,793	
65-71-3029	5-198	771	Analysis of all pay rolls.	do.	Nov. 4, 1935.	26	May 1937.	19,019	3,500
65-71-5238	5-69	946	Revision of lists of tuberculosis cases.	do.	do.	58	December 1936.	8,091	2,275
65-71-1563	5-95	949	Transcription of musical scores.	do.	Nov. 18, 1935.	43	February 1937.	7,987	100
65-71-1355	5-89	951	Modernization of records department of hospital admission, division of relief.	do.	Nov. 6, 1935.	56	December 1936.	19,294	650
65-71-5026	5-143	1296	Clerical, Hennepin County probate office.	do.	Nov. 13, 1935.	63	October 1936.	2,574	347
65-71-5024	5-142	1367	Clerical and stenographic.	do.	Nov. 12, 1935.	60	do.	4,290	372
65-71-4236	5-178	1528	Clerical, modernizing maps, etc.	do.	Nov. 25, 1935.	23	September 1937.	63,267	453
65-71-5752	5-130	1765	Clerical, board of park commissioners.	do.	Nov. 26, 1935.	98	July 1936.	25,573	1,392
65-71-5373	5-168	1766	Clerical, bring records up to date.	do.	Nov. 25, 1935.	39	March 1937.	24,468	2,160
65-71-5364	5-158	1781	Indexing and cataloging city comptroller's accounts.	do.	Dec. 3, 1935.	50	December 1936.	80,803	15,260
65-71-6679	5-70	2269	Modernizing relief department files.	do.	May 11, 1936.	4	June 1937.	31,900	2,575
65-71-8885	5-69	2393	Inventory of educational equipment.	Minneapolis public schools.	Feb. 13, 1936.	21	do.	77,819	14,350
65-71-6100	5-43	2440	Clerical, research, main campus at university.	Minneapolis.	Feb. 6, 1936.	30	March 1937.	151,737	
65-71-420	5-45	323	Augmentation of service rendered to indigent sick.	Minneapolis General Hospital.	Oct. 21, 1935.	35	July 1937.	182,669	
65-71-1055	5-93	1389	Nursing, free and indigent patients.	Minneapolis.	Nov. 19, 1935.	86	July 1936.	33,680	
65-71-5237	5-13	1782	Laboratory work and other public-health research.	Minneapolis.	Nov. 25, 1935.	50	December 1936.	60,286	30,280
65-71-354	5-36	91	To extend the facilities for Central Library.	do.	Sept. 24, 1935.	61	September 1936.	100,782	2,000
65-71-6396	5-151	2268	Library extension work in 8 rural Hennepin.	do.	Feb. 10, 1936.	9	June 1937.	22,297	250
65-71-6614	5-261	2270	Library extension work in settlement houses.	do.	Mar. 23, 1936.	10	September 1936.	29,797	280
65-71-6894	5-253	2449	Museum project, Minneapolis Public Library.	do.	do.	1	June 1937.	4,874	100
65-71-5876	5-236	1968	Statistical.	do.	Dec. 6, 1935.	84	July 1936.	258,077	17,700
65-71-6518	5-135	2823	Survey of major land-line boundaries.	do.	May 12, 1936.	4	June 1937.	65,340	
65-71-1879	5-47	1763	Analysis of traffic survey.	do.	Nov. 25, 1935.	65	September 1936.	70,836	2,300
65-71-6417	5-219	2250	Hot lunch for school children.	Hopkins.	Jan. 13, 1936.	30	April 1936.	18,128	4,940
65-71-4216	5-215	1784	Resurvey of rural Hennepin County.	Minneapolis.	Nov. 27, 1935.	50	July 1937.	36,148	5,600
S-68-7002	5-279	2773	Research and placement for handicapped persons.	do.	Apr. 13, 1936.	26	December 1936.	13,815	
65-71-6920	5-255	2827	Comprehensive compilation of records of the division of relief.	do.	May 1, 1936.	17	June 1937.	46,945	2,800
65-71-2144	5-254	2843	Gathering historical data.	do.	do.	1	do.	6,989	200
65-71-6072	5-243	1969	Recreational facilities.	do.	Dec. 2, 1935.	78	July 1936.	103,819	
65-71-6073	5-242	1975	Public school recreational facilities.	do.	Dec. 13, 1935.	79	August 1936.	36,154	
65-71-6311	5-244	2072	Recreational project.	County-wide.	Dec. 20, 1935.	84	July 1936.	47,105	
65-71-6568	5-43	2265	Home demonstration.	Minneapolis.	Jan. 28, 1936.	58	September 1936.	24,365	375
65-71-6809	5-257	2695	Transcribe Braille for use of blind.	do.	Mar. 26, 1936.	29	December 1936.	5,910	
65-71-4839	5-228	1300	Sewing center.	Golden Valley.	Nov. 18, 1935.	70	August 1936.	14,733	830
65-71-4673	5-137	1315	do.	Robbinsdale.	Nov. 12, 1935.	41	May 1937.	49,855	1,200
65-71-5157	5-183	1356	Sewing center board of public welfare.	Minneapolis.	Nov. 25, 1935.	75	November 1936.	259,242	
65-71-6938	5-258	2694	Sewing center project.	Plymouth Township.	Mar. 23, 1936.	87	June 1936.	5,052	
65-71-4190	5-140	1154	Establish sewing control.	Minneapolis.	Nov. 4, 1935.	76	August 1936.	315,089	5,243
65-71-5126	5-172	1812	Clean and grade Bassett Creek.	do.	Nov. 26, 1935.	60	December 1936.	1,018,207	4,500
65-71-6905	5-155	2557	Cut weeds on city dumps.	do.	Mar. 6, 1936.	40	January 1937.	174,076	312
65-71-372	5-9	1622	Beautification of grounds, State soldiers' home.	do.	Nov. 15, 1935.	85	July 1936.	18,592	450
65-71-5863	5-222	2824	Grading, filling, and surfacing cemetery grounds.	do.	Apr. 27, 1936.	30	November 1936.	34,676	1,500

ISANTI COUNTY

65-71-197	2-35	158	City park.	Cambridge.	Open.	30	June 30, 1937.	\$8,091	\$2,596
65-71-1097	2-229	634	Courthouse painting.	do.	Completed.			333	168
65-71-4526	2-704	1845	Road construction.	County-wide.	Open.	78	Mar. 31, 1937.	18,097	3,250
65-71-938	2-214	1605	School building construction.	District no. 49, Stanford Township.	do.	94	July 7, 1936.	4,035	3,184
65-71-5681	2-959	2028	Irrigation system.	Epileptics Colony, Cambridge.	July 30, 1936.	22	Nov. 30, 1936.	37,235	1,084

W. P. A. projects in operation or authorized for work—Continued
ISANTI COUNTY—continued

Official project no.	State serial no.	Work project no.	Description	Location	Starting date	Percent of completion to date	Estimated date of completion	Federal funds	Sponsor funds
65-71-6038	2-406	2363	"C" type dam.....	Green Lake, Cambridge.....	Open.....	77	July 22, 1936.....	\$7,740	\$727
65-71-6432	2-837	2252	Hot lunches.....	Braham.....	Completed.....	385	126
65-71-1572	2-293	674	Courthouse lawn repairs.....	Cambridge.....	do.....	511	517
65-71-454	2-108	1635	Road repairs.....	Dalbo Township.....	do.....	2,816	890
65-71-1096	2-228	833	Clerical, registrar of deeds office.....	Cambridge.....	do.....	297
65-71-5337	2-611	2837	School library book repair.....	do.....	Oct. 1, 1936.....	0	May 30, 1937.....	1,980	104

WASHINGTON COUNTY

65-71-614	4-65	426	Road repairs.....	Lincoln.....	Oct. 24, 1935.....	Completed.....	\$8,588	\$2,014
65-71-475	4-74	369	do.....	Stillwater.....	do.....	79	July 2, 1936.....	5,856	2,321
65-71-1806	4-102	828	Street repairs.....	Forest Lake.....	Nov. 4, 1935.....	65	Sept. 2, 1936.....	9,379	1,670
65-71-1694	4-103	1579	do.....	Mahtomedi.....	Jan. 1, 1936.....	31	Apr. 2, 1937.....	12,434	3,299
65-71-2035	4-185	2000	Retaining wall.....	Marine.....	Dec. 23, 1935.....	40	Oct. 2, 1936.....	6,710	180
65-71-4240	4-223	1417	Roadside beautification.....	Stillwater.....	Nov. 11, 1935.....	62	Aug. 2, 1936.....	27,590	10,597
65-71-615	4-75	427	Road repairs.....	do.....	Oct. 24, 1935.....	58	Feb. 2, 1937.....	23,172	5,744
65-71-4838	4-267	1509	Sidewalk and streets.....	St. Paul Park.....	Nov. 26, 1935.....	61	Oct. 2, 1936.....	9,895	500
65-71-5108	4-174	1580	Street repairs.....	Newport.....	Dec. 23, 1935.....	42	Jan. 2, 1937.....	7,148	450
65-71-1469	4-141	846	Courthouse repairs.....	Stillwater.....	Dec. 2, 1935.....	55	Nov. 2, 1936.....	14,572	535
S-26-6251	4-402	2856	Armory repairs.....	do.....	May 18, 1936.....	22	May 2, 1937.....	9,440	870
S-26-1171	4-108	627	Park improvements.....	do.....	Nov. 6, 1935.....	55	Nov. 17, 1936.....	12,982	675
S-26-2081	4-181	2553	do.....	Forest Lake.....	Apr. 1, 1936.....	Completed.....	3,462	549
S-26-1468	4-140	945	Clerical, county records.....	Stillwater.....	Nov. 4, 1936.....	43	Jan. 2, 1937.....	10,494	200
S-26-4455	4-184	1542	Clerical.....	do.....	Dec. 2, 1935.....	7	June 30, 1937.....	23,672
S-26-6551	4-393	2606	Recreational.....	do.....	Mar. 16, 1936.....	24	Feb. 2, 1937.....	8,863
S-26-4454	4-78	1462	Sewing project.....	do.....	Nov. 15, 1935.....	75	Sept. 2, 1936.....	16,834	200
S-26-1170	4-107	636	Oil treating of gravel.....	do.....	Nov. 4, 1935.....	62	do.....	19,470	1,175
S-26-1470	4-146	729	Crushing gravel.....	do.....	Nov. 26, 1935.....	62	Aug. 2, 1936.....	8,087	3,190
S-26-6214	4-360	1917	Educational.....	Forest Lake.....	Dec. 2, 1935.....	25	Closed, not to reopen.....	3,087

DESCRIPTION OF SOME THIRD DISTRICT W. P. A. PROJECTS

I wish to describe briefly some of the W. P. A. Third District projects approved at Washington.

Anoka County

State serial no. 2-668.
Official project no. 5397.
Federal funds, \$57,540.
Sponsors' contribution, none.
Total funds, \$57,540.
Location: Anoka, Anoka.
Total man-years of work, 91.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 175.
Total paid from Federal funds, 182.
Federal expenditure, \$632.31.

General repairs and improvements to town roads, none of which are Federal-aid highways or State highways, Anoka County, exclusive of that work which has been requested on individual project proposals submitted by the following: Burns, Ramsey, Bethel, Linwood, Ham Lake, and Grow Townships.

Streets, Columbia Heights

State serial no. 2-94—not a new project.
Supplement no. 1—original official project no. 499.
Federal funds, \$6,606.
Sponsors' contribution, none.
Total funds, \$6,606.
Location: Anoka County, Columbia Heights.
Total man-years of work, 6.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 33.
Total paid from Federal funds, 33.
Federal expenditure, \$1,201.

This application supplements official project 65-71-499. Approved on Presidential Letter No. 357, described as follows: "Sub-grading Forty-second Avenue West, Central Avenue to University Avenue."

Columbia Heights Tannery

State serial no. 2-64.
Official project no. 5873.
Federal funds, \$47,218.43.
Sponsors' contribution, none.
Total funds, \$47,218.43.
Location, Anoka County, St. Paul.
Total man-years of work, 46.16.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 43.16.
Total paid from Federal funds, 46.16.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$1,022.76.

Tanning of F. S. R. C. cowhides to be carried on in an abandoned tannery located at Columbia Heights, Minn. There is an apparent need for this tannery, as there is only one other cowhide tannery within the State of Minnesota. This is an emergency in order to preserve hides on hand and is a continuation of an existing E. R. A. project.

Anoka County Ditches

State serial no. 2-642.
Official project no. 3169.
Federal funds, \$24,450.
Sponsor's contribution, none.
Total funds, \$24,450.
Location, Anoka County, Anoka.
Total man-years of work, 47.5.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 56.
Total paid from Federal funds, 57.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$514.73.
Regrade, excavate, and clean out county ditch no. 44 and lateral ditches nos. 1 and 2.

Anoka Game Refuge

State serial no. 2-337.
Official project no. 4763.
Federal funds, \$21,762.18.
Sponsor's contribution, \$3,100.
Total funds, \$24,862.15.
Total man-years of work, 16.60.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 48.91.
Total paid from Federal funds, 49.81.
Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$1,310.84.
Carlos Avery Game Refuge:
Construction of one addition to warden's cottage 14 by 24 feet, one 2-car garage 20 by 26 feet, one 5-room house 22 by 26 feet, one 3-room cottage 24 by 30 feet, one 4-car garage 26 by 45 feet, one storage building and workshop 20 by 80 feet, one incubation building 150 by 30 feet, 200 brooder coops, weeding around young trees, construction of new firebreaks and reconstruction of old firebreaks, collection and distribution of bird food. This work to be done on Carlos Avery Game Refuge located in N $\frac{1}{2}$ of SE $\frac{1}{4}$, sec. 6, T. 32 N, R. 22 W., in Anoka County.

Chisago County

State serial no. 2-336.
Official project no. 1264.
Federal funds, \$27,327.
Sponsors contribution, \$1,366.66.
Total funds, \$28,693.66.
Location: Chisago, St. Paul.
Total man-years of work, 51.33.
Persons taken from relief rolls, 77.
Total paid from Federal funds, 77.
Federal expenditure, \$532.34.
(1) Reroof eight cottages; (2) rebuild over porches on cabins; (3) move two buildings to South Park; (4) make shutters for eight buildings; (5) construct Imhoff tank and tile disposal line; (6) paint eight buildings; (7) grade parking area in North Park, also in South Park; (8) construct guard rail around parking area and pot holes; (9) plant trees and shrubs in South Park picnic area; (10) construct foot trails.

Lindstrom Parks

State serial no. 2-373.
 Official project no. 1687.
 Federal funds, \$10,464.
 Sponsors' contribution, \$506.50.
 Total funds, \$10,970.50.
 Location: Chisago County, Lindstrom.
 Total man-years of work, 21.33.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 31.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 32.
 Federal expenditure, \$490.50.
 Construction of three parks and playgrounds, and landscaping, leveling, and improving a municipally owned cemetery in the village of Lindstrom.

Chisago Chain of Lakes

State serial no. 2-728.
 Official project no. 4184.
 Federal funds, \$264,390.
 Sponsors' contribution, \$5,000.
 Total funds, \$269,390.
 Location: Chisago County, St. Paul.
 Total man-years of work, 416.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 414.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 416.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$635.52.
 This project proposes to divert water from the Sunrise River, near Kost, to the Chisago chain of lakes. This will require the construction of a channel and pumping plant.

Hennepin County

State serial no. 5-184.
 Official project no. 5029.
 Federal funds, \$19,569.
 Sponsor's contribution, \$5,117.
 Total funds, \$24,686.50.
 Location: Hennepin, St. Louis Park.
 Total man-years of work, 24.61.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 96.43.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 98.43.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$795.22.
 The village of St. Louis Park desires to provide a public park and recreational facilities. The work will consist of grading, driveway construction, drainage, planting of trees and shrubs and the building of tennis courts, field house and athletic fields. This is known as project A and is located on Brunswick Avenue, 1,200 feet north of Excelsior Boulevard.

St. Louis Park Recreational Facilities

State serial no. 5-209.
 Official project no. 3186.
 Federal funds, \$16,925.
 Sponsor's contribution, \$6,790.50.
 Total funds, \$23,715.50.
 Location: Hennepin, St. Louis Park.
 Total man-years of work, 20.8.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 86.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 88.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$812.08.
 The village of St. Louis Park desires to provide recreational facilities for the public use. The work will include grading, drainage, planting of trees and shrubs, walk and drive construction, etc. This is known as project B and is located on the new State Highway No. 7 and Minnesota Boulevard.

Hennepin County Lake Shore Lines

State serial no. 5-217.
 Official project no. 5240.
 Federal funds, \$503,580.60.
 Sponsor's contribution, none.
 Total funds, \$503,580.60.
 Location: Hennepin County, Minneapolis.
 Total man-years of work, 600.1.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 705.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 721.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$838.14.
 The cleaning up of approximately 365 miles of public shore line on 58 lakes in rural Hennepin County, as said cleaning to consist of cutting and burning of brush and noxious weeds and trimming of trees under direction of competent landscape engineers. The work herewith contemplated specifically excludes any and all work included on applications previously submitted.

Elm Creek, Champlin

State serial no. 5-224.
 Official project 4488.
 Federal funds, \$10,320.
 Sponsor's contribution, \$4,119.50.
 Total funds, \$14,439.50.
 Location: Hennepin County, Champlin.
 Total man-years of work, 13.25.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 52.

Total paid from Federal funds, 53.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$778.86.
 Replace dam on Elm Creek at Champlin and clean out creek and lake bed for a distance of 2 miles above the dam.

Robbinsdale Parks

State serial no. 5-117.
 Official project no. 2056.
 Federal funds, \$11,454.50.
 Sponsor's contribution, \$3,709.50.
 Total funds, \$15,164.
 Location: Hennepin County, Minneapolis.
 Total man-years of work, 15.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 43.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 45.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$763.63.
 This project consists of trimming and planting of trees along all the village streets and parks of the village of Robbinsdale.

Hopkins Storm Sewer

State serial no. 5-147.
 Official project no. 5026.
 Federal funds, \$11,375.
 Sponsor's contribution, \$14,220.
 Total funds, \$25,595.20.
 Location: Hennepin County, Hopkins.
 Total man-years of work, 15.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 33.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 36.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$758.33.
 Hopkins storm sewer on following streets: Intersection of Excelsior Avenue and Seventh Avenue, on Seventh to First Streets south to Thirteenth Avenue, south thence through open ditch to Ninemile Creek.

Isanti County

State serial no. 2-801.
 Official project no. 2992.
 Federal funds, \$30,100.
 Sponsor's contribution, \$2,500.
 Total funds, \$32,600.
 Location: Ramsey County-Isanti County.
 Total man-years of work, 28.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 50.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 56.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$1,075.
 Reconstruction of Highways Nos. 56, 95, 118 in Isanti County, not on Federal-aid system.

Washington County

State serial no. 5-92.
 Official project no. 994.
 Federal funds, \$15,202.
 Additional amount approved, \$9,402 on supplement no. 1.
 Sponsors' contribution, \$1,971.
 Total funds, \$17,173.
 Location: St. Paul Park.
 Total man-years of work, 19.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 54.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 56.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$822.
 Grade 1 mile and gravel 23 miles of streets in St. Louis Park, per appendage attached to application.

Mahtomedi Streets

State serial no. 4-103.
 Official project no. 1664.
 Federal funds, \$11,304.50.
 Sponsor's contribution, \$3,299.95.
 Total funds, \$14,604.45.
 Location: Washington County, Mahtomedi.
 Total man-years of work, 20.33.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 19.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 20.33.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$21.33.
 Village street improvements and repairs in village as listed on proposal.

Bayport Street Improvements

State serial no. 4-186.
 Official project no. 1947.
 Federal funds, \$14,139.
 Sponsor's contribution, \$2,802.
 Total funds, \$16,941.
 Location: Washington County, Bayport.
 Total man-years of work, 23.3.
 Persons taken from relief rolls, 22.25.
 Total paid from Federal funds, 23.30.
 Federal expenditure per man-year of labor, \$605.95.
 Street improvements: Grade and gravel streets as designated and located on W. P. A. form 301; gravel balance of streets as graded on S. E. R. A.; enclose creek bed on Third Avenue between Third and Fourth Streets, a distance of 167 feet, with reinforced concrete slab on concrete footings, surfacing over same; grade and fill area at foot of Central Avenue and construct stone and concrete retaining wall at end, size 8 by 500 feet.

W. P. A. EDUCATIONAL, CULTURAL, AND RECREATION PROJECTS

Some fine service has been rendered by the Federal W. P. A. cultural projects, such as the Federal music project, recreation projects, adult and workers' education.

FEDERAL MUSIC PROJECT

The Federal music project was created to employ, retrain, and rehabilitate those musicians who because of the depression faced loss of employment and resulting deterioration of skill. By March 21, 1936, 15,639 of such people were on W. P. A. pay rolls in the United States.

This is truly a cultural reclamation project. It includes instrumentalists, vocalists, composers, teachers, librarians, copyists and arrangers, tuners, and music binders. There have been 163 approved symphony and concert W. P. A. orchestras, 51 bands, a composers' project, 15 chamber music ensembles, 22 choruses and quartets, 69 popular orchestras, 146 teachers' projects; opera and operetta projects, and 1 folk-song project to preserve early Kentucky hills music. State universities and local boards of education cooperate with the W. P. A. in this work.

MINNESOTA W. P. A. MUSIC PROJECT

As of May 28, 1936, there were 269 people working on the Minnesota W. P. A. music project, 244 of these from relief rolls. There were 52 teachers giving 307 classes weekly, with an enrollment of 3,439 pupils. There were 33 performances during 1 week, at which an attendance of 13,875 was reported. A series of concerts was being planned at the University of Minnesota sponsored by the Federal music project. A composers' forum laboratory was to be organized. We must not permit the depression to demobilize American culture.

I was happy to aid in securing approval of the Federal music project. For some time the project was held up in Washington. I received a wire from the St. Paul Musicians' Association asking assistance. We kept in constant touch with the W. P. A. at Washington until the project was approved. The St. Paul Musicians' Association, Mr. Edward P. Ringius, secretary-treasurer, wrote me a letter with reference to this project, in which he stated:

DEAR MR. LUNDEEN: I read your circular letter to our local at their monthly meeting held Saturday, June 9, and I was instructed to acknowledge receipt of same and to let you know that our organization appreciated this information and commends you very highly for your work. With best wishes for your future success, we are,

Sincerely and fraternally yours,

ST. PAUL MUSICIANS' ASSOCIATION,
By EDW. P. RINGIUS, Secretary-Treasurer.

STILLWATER MUSIC PROJECT

During February there were W. P. A. piano classes at Stillwater and Mahtomedi. An address on music, at Stillwater High School, regarding the value of rural music education, was given; 300 persons were present. A chorus was formed at Stillwater, Welander, and Marine. A community music meeting was held at Stillwater with 200 people present.

DOWLING SCHOOL SWIMMING POOL

One W. P. A. project of which we were very pleased to receive approval is the swimming pool at the Michael Dowling School for Crippled Children, in Minneapolis (project 5735).

We had difficulty in obtaining approval of this project. The W. P. A. at first considered the cost per man-year too high. On September 30, 1935, I received a letter from Mrs. George B. Palmer stating: "It looks as though you will have to be our savior if anything is done about getting a swimming pool for these poor little fellows who really need a helping hand."

Original plans called for a total cost of \$51,351 for the swimming pool. As finally approved, we will have a \$69,875 project. Construction was begun on February 27, 1936. There was a celebration at Dowling School when the work got under way. I received an invitation on February 25, 1936, stating:

The culmination of the individual and collective efforts of the large number of friends of the crippled children in Minneapolis, in the procuring of a swimming pool and therapeutic

center at the Dowling School for Crippled Children, Thirty-ninth Street South, and River Road West, will be realized by the breaking of ground for the construction of this center on Friday morning, February 28, 1936, at 10 o'clock.

You have taken such a personal interest in this project that it gives us great pleasure to extend to you a most cordial invitation to be present at this momentous ceremony.

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. DRAKE,
President, the Board of Education,
Minneapolis, Minn.

WORKERS' EDUCATION

Minnesota educators and labor organizations are tremendously interested in having the workers' education project continue. This year there was a long delay in getting the project started. This was true in every State with the exception of Wisconsin. We protested against the delay and assisted in bringing about approval of the Minnesota workers' education project. The project was finally started, giving employment to teachers and new educational opportunities for workers. The Minnesota State Department of Education, under the able direction of Dr. John G. Rockwell, has cooperated in every way to make the program a success.

We are assured by the W. P. A. officials at Washington in charge of this splendid program that it will be continued next year. Plans are being made to enlarge and improve the program, and there is every indication that next year's workers' education project will be even more beneficial than before.

THIRD DISTRICT W. P. A. PROJECTS APPROVED AT WASHINGTON BUT NOT YET STARTED

The W. P. A. projects listed above as approved at Washington is longer than the list of projects authorized for work by the W. P. A. administrator for Minnesota. This means that we have secured approval of a large number of projects at Washington which have not yet been started by the Minnesota W. P. A. office. In order to start these projects, the W. P. A. must be granted sufficient funds by Congress. We have now appropriated a large sum for the continuation of W. P. A. activities. In addition to funds, we need the cooperation of local, county, and State officials, and other interested citizens. Let them express an interest in these projects, and see that they are started. Local and county officials, and other citizens at home must cooperate with the Representatives and Senators at Washington in order that projects may be started. The Congressman's main service on projects is to secure approval at Washington.

CHISAGO CHAIN OF LAKES PROJECT

One of these projects approved at Washington, but not yet started, is the Chisago chain of lakes. Citizens of Chisago County are greatly interested in the raising of beautiful Chisago chain of lakes. In my speech on the floor of the House on January 18, 1934, I gave full information concerning this project. The lakes are less than half the size they were 15 years ago. The cost of raising them to their former level is estimated at about \$320,000.

Last fall we secured approval of the W. P. A., President Roosevelt, and the Comptroller General at Washington of the Chisago chain of lakes project, and it appears on the list of approved projects furnished us by the W. P. A. at Washington. The Federal funds are available. The matter of funds for upkeep is still in debate. It is possible that an appropriation might be obtained from the State legislature to cover this cost.

This is again a case where the cooperation of local, county, and State government officials is badly needed. Federal funds have been set aside for the Chisago chain of lakes project, and we hope that the difficulties preventing work on this project will be removed in the near future.

On March 10, 1936, we received a letter from Walter S. Olson, director of the Division of Drainage and Waters of the Minnesota State Department of Conservation, to whom the Minnesota W. P. A. office has referred the Chisago chain of lakes project for recommendation. Mr. Olson stated:

Some 2 months ago a delegation of 10 or 15 men from this district called on Mr. Willard with regard to this project, and at

which conference I was present. The project as presented stipulated that the control, operation, and maintenance of the project after its completion by W. P. A. was to be taken over by some local governmental agency. This is in accordance with the procedure of W. P. A.

When it was called to the attention of these people at the conference that the pumping costs alone on this project would run to approximately \$10,000 for every foot of water placed from the proposed diversion, no one indicated a willingness or authority to assume this responsibility. It was suggested at that time by them that the State take over the operation of the project. However, we know of no means whereby the State could do so unless the legislature appropriated sufficient funds.

Since that time there has been no evidence of local interest in the project. There will be many things to clear up before it can be in such shape as W. P. A. could start construction, such as obtaining commitments, and also field works and design, and possibly some legal phases such as satisfying the power interests on the Sunrise River below the point of diversion.

The matters to be "cleared up" in order that construction on the Chisago chain of lakes project could begin are matters handled successfully in connection with numerous other water projects.

CHISAGO CHAIN OF LAKES WILL BE RESTORED

Personally, I see no difficulties which cannot be overcome. Right now the local officials, organizations, and other citizens of Chisago and neighboring counties would do much to advance this project by calling on the State division of drainage and waters, and the officials of the State department of conservation, proving that Chisago County is interested in this project. Federal funds have already been approved. Our work in Washington on this project has been done, and we are going to continue working with State and county government officials so that this project may be started. There is no good reason why the Chisago chain of lakes cannot be restored to their original state.

FEDERAL RELIEF IN MINNESOTA

Federal funds have also been disbursed to Minnesota through the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. We do not have the amounts provided by the Federal Relief Administration to the Third District counties, but we do have the total amounts for the State during the years 1933, 1934, and 1935.

Amount of obligations incurred for emergency relief in Minnesota

States and quarters	Obligations incurred for emergency relief						
	Total amount	Federal funds		State funds		Local funds	
		Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent	Amount	Per cent
MINNESOTA							
1933							
First quarter.....	\$2,316,259	\$1,427,008	61.6	\$1,834	0.1	\$887,417	38.7
Second quarter.....	2,078,065	1,143,127	55.0	6,790	.3	928,178	44.0
Third quarter.....	2,043,555	935,181	45.8	5,353	.2	1,103,021	54.5
Fourth quarter.....	2,613,903	1,291,085	49.3	5,217	.2	1,317,601	50.3
Total 1933.....	9,051,782	4,796,401	53.0	19,164	.2	4,236,217	46.8
1934							
First quarter.....	3,126,537	1,990,767	63.7	454,015	14.5	681,755	21.8
Second quarter.....	7,872,735	6,780,033	86.1	350,271	4.5	742,431	9.4
Third quarter.....	9,912,601	8,830,105	89.1	136,228	1.4	946,268	9.5
Fourth quarter.....	14,231,099	10,945,333	76.7	1,004,122	7.0	2,331,644	16.3
Total 1934.....	35,192,972	28,546,238	81.1	1,944,636	5.5	4,702,098	13.4
1935							
First quarter.....	14,839,210	11,617,115	78.3	1,222,030	8.2	2,000,065	13.5
Second quarter.....	14,648,329	12,279,877	83.8	963,639	6.6	1,404,813	9.6
Third quarter.....	8,483,167	6,826,865	80.5	380,526	4.5	1,275,776	15.0
Fourth quarter.....	6,440,943	3,711,277	57.6	932,097	14.5	1,797,569	27.9
Total 1935.....	44,411,649	34,435,134	77.5	3,498,292	7.9	6,478,223	14.6
Total 1933, 1934, and 1935.....	88,656,403	67,777,773	76.4	5,462,092	6.2	15,416,538	17.4

The above figures include obligations incurred for relief extended under the general relief program under all special programs, and for administration. Beginning April 1934 these figures also include purchases of materials, supplies, and equipment, rental of equipment (such as team and truck hire), earnings of nonrelief persons employed, and other expenses incident to the emergency work relief program.

HOUSING

There are many Federal Government agencies concerned with homes and housing. I have already mentioned the work of the P. W. A. in connection with the Sumner Field housing project in North Minneapolis. Other agencies dealing with homes and housing are the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Following are the amounts of Federal funds obtained for Minnesota and the Third Congressional District through the Federal Housing Administration:

Volume of Federal Housing Administration business in the State of Minnesota

FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Modernization notes insured through Apr. 30, 1936		Mortgages accepted for insurance through Mar. 31, 1936	
Number	Amount	Number	Amount
14,337	\$5,457,343.12	797	\$2,625,684

FOR THE FOLLOWING COUNTIES

	Modernization notes insured through Apr. 30, 1936		Mortgages accepted for insurance through Mar. 31, 1936	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Anoka.....	68	\$17,127.86	9	\$24,285
Chisago.....	16	5,244.03	2	3,800
Hennepin.....	4,915	2,040,180.75	369	1,367,371
Isanti.....	9	6,327.24	1	2,500
Washington.....	105	40,977.48	3	12,225
Total.....	5,113	2,109,837.36	384	1,410,181

The funds advanced were made available entirely through private banking and lending institutions. The release of such a large volume of credit has directly stimulated modernization, repair, and construction activity, thereby giving employment to thousands of workers in Minnesota. In addition, through the instrumentality of the Federal Housing Administration, substantial progress has been made in building a sounder and more economical structure of mortgage loans, enabling an increasing number of individuals to own homes of their own.

WORKERS' HOUSING PROJECT

Another project now under consideration by the Federal Housing Administration is the so-called workers' housing project for 500 low-cost dwellings, sponsored by several Minneapolis cooperative and labor organizations, including the Minneapolis Central Labor Union, the City Planning Commission, the Northern States Cooperative League, the Junior Association of Commerce, the Building Trades Council, the Mayor's Housing Committee, and other citizens of Minneapolis interested in constructing a low-cost non-profit housing project for the city of Minneapolis.

We have discussed this project with Mr. Miles L. Collean, Director of the Low Cost Housing Division of the Federal Housing Administration, and many other Government officials and have been given encouragement for the project. At the present time the sponsors of the project are having difficulty in procuring the site and furnishing the sponsor's share

of funds. We hope these difficulties can be worked out and that north Minneapolis and the Third Congressional District will have another large housing project in the not distant future.

EMPLOYMENT IN CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Often there were times when pressure was needed at Washington to release Federal Housing Administration funds for Minnesota. Mr. Albert O. Larson, president of the Minnesota Association of Architects, who also had charge of the Housing Corporation office in Minnesota, has written me:

As president of the Minnesota Association of Architects I wish to express appreciation for your stand in behalf of the building trades in the support of legislation designed to help the building industry. So far the New Deal has helped this industry but little, and it is our hope that the work of the Housing Corporation and the Federal Housing Administration may proceed effectively and immediately.

Your realization that the construction of better housing, hospitals, and schools not only provides much needed employment but adds to the capital wealth of the country should bring you satisfaction when this program is actually under way.

Your part in this program should bring you loyal support from those who appreciate the importance of building activity to business recovery.

Sincerely,

ALBERT O. LARSON,

President, Minnesota Association of Architects.

HOME OWNERS' LOAN CORPORATION

I voted to create the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and provide it with funds to help save the American home—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 2584, April 28, 1933.

During the past 2 years we have handled hundreds of Home Owners' Loan cases, and sometimes we were able to save the homes of people who were about to lose them. Fol-

lowing are the number of home loans to citizens of the Third Congressional District:

Refinancing operations completed by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation as of Jan. 2, 1936

TOTAL LOANS CLOSED FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Number	Amount
20,163.....	\$46,042,849

TOTAL OF LOANS CLOSED FOR THE FOLLOWING COUNTIES

	Number	Amount
Anoka.....	280	\$483,677
Chisago.....	57	103,164
Hennepin.....	7,100	18,817,589
Isanti.....	57	93,682
Washington.....	249	420,325
Total.....	7,743	1,991,847

These loans, representing long-term obligations, were granted at low rates of interest to those who were in urgent need of funds for the protection and preservation of their homes, and who were unable to procure the needed credit through the normal channels. A great majority of the distressed individuals, taking advantage of the assistance offered by this Federal agency, were helped to refinance defaulting mortgages and save their homes from foreclosure.

RESETTLEMENT ADMINISTRATION

Another Government agency through which Federal funds have been obtained for Minnesota and the Third Congressional District is the Resettlement Administration. Following are the amounts received from this source:

Loans and grants made by Rural Rehabilitation Division of the Resettlement Administration as of Apr. 30, 1936
FOR THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

	Families receiving farm management loans		Families receiving emergency rehabilitation loans		Families receiving emergency grants		Total amount of loans and grants
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	
Total.....	5,324	\$3,924,129.00	1,729,218	\$2,284,114.23	7,528	\$513,411.12	\$6,721,654.53

TOTALS FOR THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES

Anoka.....	51	\$21,399.00	348	\$19,149.00	127	\$9,492.00	\$50,040.00
Chisago.....	45	19,859.00	281	8,168.60	45	2,923.00	30,950.60
Hennepin.....	56	25,904.90	589	24,489.66	131	9,561.20	59,955.76
Isanti.....	69	26,279.73	798	56,161.76	115	7,653.77	90,103.28
Washington.....	54	31,234.87	123	7,257.80	66	5,060.00	43,552.67
Total.....	275	124,677.50	2,139	115,226.82	484	34,694.97	274,599.29

This Federal money was distributed throughout the State in an effort to restore farm families, in the destitute and low-income groups, to a self-supporting basis; to reestablish their credit so that loans could be secured from commercial banks and the Farm Credit Administration; to improve their standards of living; and generally to increase their value to the communities as self-respecting citizens. Guidance in carrying on approved farm practices, provided for in the farm-management plans, also helped considerably toward improving the status of rehabilitation clients.

The distress of the recipients of these loans and grants was caused by circumstances beyond their control, such as war, drought, crop failure, and generally depressed agricultural conditions.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Many Third District farmers have applied for loans from the Farm Credit Administration. Following are the total amounts received from this source:

Number and amount of crop and feed loans and drought-relief loans made by the Farm Credit Administration, Jan. 1, 1933, through Sept. 30, 1935

FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

	Crop and feed loans		Drought-relief loans	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total.....	35,776	\$4,050,638	127,111	\$6,677,890

TOTALS FOR THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES

Anoka.....	649	\$65,960	229	\$42,596
Chisago.....	375	23,290	166	22,384
Hennepin.....	443	41,930	237	31,376
Isanti.....	1,441	130,908	660	98,559
Washington.....	214	19,605	133	24,876
Total.....	3,122	281,693	1,325	219,791

¹ 1934-35.

Other Farm Credit Administration loans were made through the Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner.

Number and amount of Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans closed, by counties, in Minnesota, by the Federal land bank, for the period May 1, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1935

FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

	Federal land bank		Land Bank Commissioner		Total (bank and Commissioner)	
	Number	Amount	Number	Amount	Number	Amount
Total.....	22,143	\$88,086,300	24,866	\$52,738,000	47,009	\$140,824,300

TOTALS FOR THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES

Anoka.....	212	\$409,400	315	\$432,900	527	\$842,300
Chisago.....	327	831,565	347	538,600	674	1,370,165
Hennepin.....	378	975,765	400	741,500	778	1,717,265
Isanti.....	370	761,065	446	665,600	816	1,426,665
Washington.....	259	831,165	239	453,800	498	1,284,965
Total.....	1,546	3,808,990	1,747	2,832,400	3,293	6,641,390

PRODUCTION CREDIT CORPORATION

Another Farm Credit Administration agency is the Production Credit Corporation. This Corporation made loans totaling \$8,497,001 to Minnesota from May 1, 1933, through December 31, 1935. We do not have the separate figures for the Third Congressional District.

A. A. A. PAYMENTS

As a result of participation in A. A. A. contracts, Minnesota and Third District farmers received the following amounts:

Rental and benefit payments made by the Agricultural Adjustment Administration to Minnesota farmers from May 12, 1933, through Dec. 31, 1935

FOR THE ENTIRE STATE OF MINNESOTA

	Total	Wheat	Tobacco	Corn-hogs	Sugar
Total.....	\$32,817,104	\$4,900,723.80	\$93,080.07	\$26,890,577.67	\$932,722.46

TOTALS FOR THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES

Anoka.....	\$51,250.56	\$1,584.02		\$49,675.54	
Chisago.....	37,921.17	2,866.11		35,055.06	
Hennepin.....	104,420.89	16,444.12		88,138.93	\$4,817.84
Isanti.....	32,255.53	792.68		31,463.15	
Washington.....	82,057.13	25,235.64		56,821.49	
Total.....	307,914.58	46,922.57		256,174.17	4,817.84

GRASSHOPPER-CONTROL APPROPRIATION

These are the Federal agencies which have disbursed funds to Third District and Minnesota farmers. In order for these payments to be made it was necessary for Congress to appropriate funds. Special appropriations have been made by Congress from time to time for farmers. For instance, there were the grasshopper-control funds which had to be appropriated in an emergency. Congress passed a special grasshopper-control bill, appropriating funds for eradication of grasshoppers menacing the crops of Minnesota and other States. This bill had to be rushed through without delay, and cooperation of many Congressmen and Senators was needed. I supported the grasshopper-control appropriation. After the bill was passed I was pleased to receive a letter from Mr. A. G. Ruggles, State entomologist, and Minnesota's representative on the Northwest Grasshopper Control Committee, stating:

DEAR MR. LUNDEEN: I am writing this letter to express the appreciation of myself and all of us here with your efforts to secure the Federal grasshopper appropriation. Although you had so many other matters of importance on hand that at times must have seemed of greater significance, I can assure you that your efforts in behalf of this particular appropriation are very deeply appreciated. We already have the organization under way in Minnesota, and the passing of the grasshopper bill has given the workers in Montana and the Dakotas heart to carry on the control campaign.

Very truly yours,

NORTHWEST GRASSHOPPER CONTROL COMMITTEE,
By A. G. RUGGLES.

In connection with this and other farm measures, Mr. M. W. Thatcher, legislative representative of the Farmers National Grain Corporation, wrote me:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am very grateful for your kind letter of March 27 in which you renew your assurance of support to the Farmers Union and our cooperative grain corporation.

We have always received militant and intelligent support from you, and it is profoundly appreciated. I only wish your constituents understood your high degree of service and the great energy which you consistently devote to the interests of the masses.

Sincerely yours,

M. W. THATCHER,
Farmers National Grain Corporation.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LOANS

Another Federal agency making loans to Minnesota is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Following are the amounts loaned to Minnesota and the Third Congressional District by this agency:

Loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Minnesota as of Feb. 29, 1936

LOANS MADE TO ALL COUNTIES IN MINNESOTA

Amount authorized.....\$37,026,235.12
Amount disbursed.....31,279,329.62

TOTAL LOANS MADE THIRD DISTRICT COUNTIES

	Amount authorized	Amount disbursed
Anoka.....	\$108,000.00	\$73,300.00
Chisago.....	275,000.00	177,400.00
Hennepin.....	10,552,600.00	9,926,831.49
Isanti.....	128,000.00	128,200.00
Washington.....	31,000.00	31,000.00
Total.....	11,095,600.00	10,336,731.49

C. C. C. CAMPS

As of June 10, 1936, it is estimated that the Emergency Conservation Work will have spent \$43,554,000 on C. C. C. camps in Minnesota. Up to April 30, 1936, it is estimated that Minnesota boys had sent home to their dependent relatives approximately \$8,877,000.

From the beginning of Emergency Conservation Work through June 30, 1936, it is estimated that 43,297 Minnesota men have been enrolled in the C. C. C., and that approximately 4,993 additional men have held jobs for varying periods of time as camp commanders, camp superintendents, technical men, educational advisers, skilled and unskilled laborers, and so forth. During the month of May 1936 an average of 10,047 enrolled men were working in C. C. C. camps in Minnesota.

HENNEPIN COUNTY C. C. C.

We have C. C. C. Camp SP-8 in Hennepin County. This camp started operations during the summer of 1935 and is still operating. Camp Army-1, Fort Snelling, Minn., started operations in the summer of 1934 and ceased operating about October 1, 1935.

RIVER AND HARBOR PROJECTS

The two most important river and harbor projects affecting the Third Congressional District of Minnesota are the North Minneapolis Harbor and the Red Wing Dam, which will give a 9-foot channel on the St. Croix River to the city of Stillwater. These are both connected with the Mississippi River 9-foot channel project now under construction.

RED WING DAM UNDER CONSTRUCTION

The lock at Red Wing, Minn., is already under construction. It is expected to be completed by about the end of this year, 1936. A sum of \$2,496,000 was allotted for the lock in 1935, and recently an additional \$3,000,000 has been allotted to complete the dam. On July 31, 1936, the War Department will advertise for bids for construction of the dam.

In my speech of January 18, 1934, on the floor of the House of Representatives I stated:

Dam no. 3 on the Mississippi River, above Red Wing, will give the beautiful city of Stillwater a 9-foot channel to the center of that industrial city. This dam must be constructed, and we mean to see that it is constructed. There is plenty of money available for this and other Minnesota projects, and we demand our full share for the North Star State. We want shipping up the St. Croix River with a 9-foot channel, there being no locks necessary between the third dam mentioned above Red Wing until shipping reaches the city of Stillwater. What a splendid thing this will be for Washington County and Stillwater, the county seat.

Well, we won our fight for Stillwater, Washington and Chisago Counties, in the great, friendly valley of the

beautiful St. Croix. Six million dollars was expended among our citizens, and in a few months barges and shipping will move into Bayport, Stillwater, and other Washington and Chisago County points, and harbor facilities will be improved. We aim to have a perfect channel; commerce and prosperity will bring happiness and health to our people.

The St. Croix River Improvement Association, under the leadership of Ira C. King, Edward Thelen, and other citizens of Washington County, have cooperated with us in every way in bringing pressure to bear upon Congress and the War Department at Washington, to the end that the Red Wing Dam is now being constructed.

NORTH MINNEAPOLIS HARBOR

For many years public-spirited organizations of Minneapolis have worked for the construction of a harbor on the Mississippi River at North Minneapolis. This fine harbor will serve Minnesota and the Northwest. On more than one occasion we have had the pleasure of arranging appointments with the War Department engineers for delegations of Minneapolis officials. I will continue my fight for this great Northwest project.

In the recent hearing on the North Minneapolis Harbor before the Board of Engineers at Washington every objection of the engineers was answered by capable representatives of the Minneapolis city government and Minneapolis industry. The War Department engineers are at the present time giving serious consideration to this project. They have requested further data and are making a restudy of the proposal. We are expecting to have their report in the near future. There are no objections from an engineering standpoint. By persistent, organized effort we will obtain a great harbor for Minneapolis.

MINNEAPOLIS NEEDS A HARBOR

The completion of the 9-foot channel to the door of St. Paul will not benefit Minneapolis unless we have a 9-foot channel and adequate harbor facilities in Minneapolis. The present Minneapolis terminal does not provide adequate space even for existing industries. Minneapolis is the metropolis of the Northwest and the greatest railroad center in the Northwest. It is the largest center for storing grain in the United States. It is the greatest milling center in the country. Minneapolis has diversified industries of many kinds. Savings of water transportation are of vital importance to the entire city. The cost of constructing the North Minneapolis Harbor is estimated at around \$5,000,000.

STANDARD OHIO LOCKS NEEDED

When the North Minneapolis Harbor is constructed we must demand that standard Ohio locks, 110 by 600 feet, be constructed at St. Anthony Falls. Engineers have stated that the pool above St. Anthony Falls has possibilities of being the finest inland harbor in the United States. We must have adequate shipping facilities to the north limits of Minneapolis, and in time the harbor can be extended to Coon River Dam, north of Minneapolis. A 9-foot channel to Minneapolis means to the north limit of Minneapolis, and we cannot permit any other construction.

SUPERIOR-ST. CROIX CANAL

Twenty-five years ago, when a member of the Minnesota State Legislature, I voted for a resolution authorizing a survey of the proposed Superior-St. Croix Canal, to extend from Lake Superior down the St. Croix River. After the Red Wing Dam is completed, there will be a 9-foot channel to Stillwater, and the Superior-St. Croix Canal will continue this 9-foot channel from Stillwater to Lake Superior. This project deserves the consideration of Washington County residents and the War Department at Washington. All of Minnesota and the Northwest will be made prosperous by the flow of commerce through this trade artery of the future. We need intelligent national planning, and the Superior-St. Croix Canal must hold a prominent place in any great Northwest plan.

LAC QUI PARLE PROJECT

There are many projects outside the Third Congressional District which benefit the entire State of Minnesota. My

speech of January 18, 1934—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 894—mentions many of these projects.

The Lac Qui Parle Reservoir project, which is now under construction in southwestern Minnesota, is one that took years to put in operation. Even citizens who would directly benefit by the project at times became discouraged to the extent that they ceased to make an effort for it. In November 1933 supporters of the project were greatly discouraged. On November 19, 1933, I wrote a letter to Mr. Elwood Mills, editor of the Montevideo American, and many other Minnesota editors, as follows:

DEAR MR. MILLS: The Flood Control Committee of Congress is very much interested in the Lac Qui Parle project, and I wish to assure your community, as a member of the Flood Control Committee, that I am entirely at your service and will aid in every possible way the promotion of this great project which means so much to your community and Minnesota.

I have already discussed the matter with the Public Works Administration, and will do so again in the future. Should you send individuals or committees to Washington to present this matter, these gentlemen are welcome to use my office, 1022 New House Office Building, and I will join any group that comes to Washington to put over this very important and commendable enterprise.

Will be pleased to hear from you as to developments in your neighborhood, and any resolutions and message you wish communicated to the Public Works Administration or any other department I will be glad to communicate, and will appreciate a duplicate for my files.

Sincerely yours,

ERNEST LUNDEEN.

I wrote letters to the press in the vicinity of this project, and I appealed to the officials of the various counties to go forward in spite of all, to the end that Minnesota might profit from the construction of the great Lac Qui Parle Reservoir.

In my speech of January 18, 1934, I devoted considerable attention to the Lac Qui Parle project. Through the combined cooperation of Minnesota citizens and public officials at Washington, the Lac Qui Parle project is now under way. It will prevent floods and maintain water levels in Minnesota, where this work is badly needed.

ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY

The St. Lawrence waterway is a major project of utmost importance to the North Star State. It will bring ocean-going vessels to Superior and Duluth, and connect Minnesota with the great Atlantic. It will furnish an ocean of light and power, which power will be thrown into the superpower system that some day will interlace the entire country.

From the very beginning I have supported and fought for the St. Lawrence waterway. I have joined with any and all organizations supporting the project, and will continue my efforts until we accomplish the digging of this great canal and make possible hydroelectric energy for millions of people. Minnesota produces an abundance of raw materials and finished goods which must be shipped great distances. The St. Lawrence waterway will be one great outlet for the energy and goods of our people.

VETERANS' PROJECTS

During the present session of Congress we passed a bill which will create a national cemetery for the State of Minnesota. Veterans' organizations have for years been working on this project. They secured the cooperation of Senators and Representatives at Washington. Hearings were held by congressional committees, and, as a result of recent legislation, Minnesota will have a national cemetery to be located near the Twin Cities.

Upon sending a copy of the national cemetery bill to National Commander Samuel R. Van Sant, of the Grand Army of the Republic and twice Governor of Minnesota, I received a post card stating:

DEAR FRIEND: Thanks for copy of bill on more cemeteries for ex-soldiers. More are needed. You have always favored legislation for the ex-soldiers. With best wishes,

Cordially yours,

S. R. VAN SANT.

Dr. John E. Soper, chairman of the Minnesota National Cemetery Committee, wrote me on May 26, 1936:

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wish to take this opportunity of thanking you for your wonderful help in appearing before both committees of Senate and House and making a splendid talk for

our bill. It is only by a united action that we can hope to attain its final passage. You have always stood by my buddies when called upon for help, and I trust we can always have your valuable help.

Yours most sincerely,

JOHN E. SOPER,
Chairman, Minnesota National Cemetery Committee.

There are other veterans' projects pending in the Veterans' Administration and the W. P. A. We are endeavoring to obtain additional construction and improvement of facilities at the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fort Snelling.

VETERANS' BONUS

The greatest sum of Federal money going to Minnesota and the Third Congressional District is in the form of adjusted-service certificate payments. The Veterans' Administration informs me that the face value of certificates held by 83,619 World War veterans of Minnesota as of March 31, 1936, is \$81,230,321. The amount due on these certificates, as estimated by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, is approximately \$52,789,520.36. Amounts for the Third Congressional District counties are divided as follows:

Anoka.....	\$381,374.65
Chisago.....	273,144.19
Hennepin.....	10,723,327.35
Isanti.....	250,197.51
Washington.....	512,634.63
Total.....	12,140,678.33

FIRST BONUS BILL IN 1919

It was on the Lundeen motion that the bonus bill passed the House on March 12, 1934. The first bonus bill ever presented to Congress was brought to my congressional office in 1919 by representatives of the Private Soldiers and Sailors Legion. I placed the first bonus bill before the Speaker of the House and the Vice President of the United States, who presided over the House and Senate, in 1919.

In this connection I wish to insert a short editorial appearing in a recent issue of the Minneapolis Labor Review:

VETERANS WON'T FORGET LUNDEEN

One man the veterans who are now receiving the bonus will not and should not forget is Farmer-Labor Congressman ERNEST LUNDEEN.

When the enemies of the Patman bill and even the author himself thought it was buried forever in committee, it was LUNDEEN who resurrected it through a petition for action, and who kept hammering until names enough were obtained to compel Congress to act.

So, through the determination of this Farmer-Laborite, himself a veteran of the Spanish-American War, the bonus bill was kept alive and finally passed.

The bonus bill was not a grandstand measure with Congressman LUNDEEN. It was something to be worked for in silence of oblivion as well as when the bands were playing.

Just as he worked and worked until the bonus became a reality, so LUNDEEN will work until his measure for social security for all is enacted into law.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS GIVE COOPERATION

Federal emergency agencies have done a great deal to alleviate distress in Minnesota, and in the Third Congressional District we have been able to secure the cooperation of Government officials in Washington as well as the folks back home. We have been extended every courtesy by Works Progress Administrator Hon. Harold L. Ickes and his staff of workers. They have cooperated with us in the matter of arranging appointments for Minnesota delegations who have come to Washington in the interest of some project. We have also been able to secure from them prompt information and reports on a score of projects. They have given courteous and prompt attention to our requests, whether by letter, telephone, or personal call. They have furnished us with complete, up-to-date information on our Third District projects, and that information has been included in my remarks here.

Captain Radford, in charge of Minnesota's P. W. A. office, has given us like cooperation at all times.

Hon. Harry L. Hopkins, Works Progress Administrator, in spite of his multitude of heavy responsibilities, has always given myself and my office his prompt cooperation and careful attention to Third District projects. He has furnished information and reports whenever requested. Mr. D. W. Beman and other officials under Mr. Hopkins have given us

much of their time to prepare the information needed for this report, keeping us informed at all times on Minnesota projects.

I have always found both Mr. Hopkins and Mr. Ickes willing to open their offices for appointments with only a few hours' notice. On numerous occasions we have received personal attention to our more urgent requests for action or information. We also appreciate the complete information recently received on short notice from Minnesota Works Progress Administrator, Hon. Victor Christgau. We wired Mr. Christgau for this information, telling him we must have it by a certain date. He immediately put his office force to work on a Third Congressional District report, and we received it by air mail on the date set.

The same prompt, courteous service was received from Mrs. Anna Dickie Olesen, Minnesota's director for the National Emergency Council, who furnished us by air mail much information concerning funds disbursed through Federal agencies to Minnesota and the Third Congressional District.

TEAMWORK NEEDED

At all times local government bodies, organizations, and other individuals should keep their representatives at Washington informed of projects being started locally, so that these projects can be followed up by the Congressmen and Senators from the very first. No one official and no one organization can accomplish what has been accomplished and what will be accomplished in Minnesota and the Third Congressional District in the way of utilizing the funds made available by Congress to alleviate unemployment, build useful public projects, and carry on educational and cultural activity. Experience and teamwork count.

EXPERIENCE COUNTS

Government at Washington is complicated. There is much red tape to unwind and much to learn about Federal agencies before the proper method of securing action can be learned. An individual who comes to Washington endeavoring to secure action on some project unaided finds himself in a maze of offices. He is passed from one clerk to another and often leaves the city with practically nothing accomplished. Congressmen and Senators and their office forces are here to serve, to advise, and to guide citizens in these matters; to make appointments for them; to secure the information needed.

Congressmen and Senators must study and learn the best ways of securing information and action. This knowledge comes after years of intensive application to the job. I have learned much along this line in dealing with these numerous projects. The more we learn the more effective we become in dealing with these matters. This applies to legislative matters as well as public projects. With this added experience, my office at Washington is now able to serve more effectively than ever before. We welcome inquiries and requests for assistance. I will remain in Washington for several weeks, so that I may give personal attention to these matters.

ORGANIZATION AND PRESSURE NEEDED AT HOME

Whenever we have been able to secure approval of some large Government project or grant, we have had the cooperation not only of Government officials at Washington but of public-spirited, active citizens of Minnesota and the Third District. I cannot emphasize too strongly the importance of cooperation of city, county, and State officials on these matters. The Hennepin County commissioners and the Minneapolis aldermen have held conference after conference with Congressmen, Senators, and other Federal Government officials during the past 3 years.

Congressmen and Senators at Washington act as a continuous moving force behind these projects. Interested citizens at home must make their pressure felt through their local and county officials, and their own letters, wires, committees, and personal calls. Local organizations and local institutions play a great part in bringing to the North Star State her just share of these Federal funds.

Federal funds obtained for Hennepin County and Third Congressional District
[Estimated, 1933-36—not complete]

Third District counties	P. W. A. allotments as of May 1936	W. P. A. allotments as of Feb. 29, 1936	F. C. A. crop, feed, and drought loans (Sept. 30, 1935)	F. H. A. moderniza- tion notes, Apr. 30, 1936	H. O. L. C. loans as of Jan. 2, 1936	Resettle- ment Ad- ministra- tion loans as of Apr. 30, 1936	R. F. C. loans as of Feb. 29, 1936	Adjusted- service cer- tificates	Federal land bank loans as of Dec. 31, 1935	A. A. A. payments to Dec. 31, 1935	Total for each county
Anoka.....	\$12,150	\$496,335	\$108,556	\$17,127.86	\$483,677	\$50,040.00	\$108,000	\$381,374.65	\$842,300	\$51,259.56	\$2,550,820.07
Chisago.....	31,967	440,657	45,674	5,244.03	103,164	30,950.60	275,000	273,144.19	1,370,165	37,921.17	2,613,886.99
Hennepin.....	9,618,891	25,995,737	73,306	2,040,160.75	18,817,589	59,955.76	10,552,600	10,723,327.35	1,717,265	104,420.89	79,703,252.75
Isanti.....	212,310	138,068	229,467	6,327.24	93,662	90,100.26	129,000	250,197.51	1,426,665	32,255.83	2,608,052.84
Washington.....	76,482	338,375	44,481	40,977.48	420,325	43,552.67	31,000	512,634.63	1,284,965	82,057.13	2,874,849.91
Total.....	9,951,800	27,409,172	501,484	2,109,837.36	19,918,417	274,599.29	11,095,600	12,140,678.33	6,641,360	307,914.58	90,350,862.56

PATMAN-ROBINSON ANTI-CHAIN-STORE BILL—PROTECT INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS AND INDEPENDENT BANKERS

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the Patman-Robinson anti-chain-store bill. The independent merchant and the independent banker must be protected against the growing menace of chains. Chain stores and chain banks transfer local funds to great financial centers. We pour billions of dollars of relief into local communities, and through chain stores these funds are poured back again into financial centers of the East. Losses are suffered not only by the local banker and the local merchant, but also by the whole community.

The people of this country cannot be prosperous and happy if chains are permitted to drain local communities of their wealth. The independent merchant and the independent banker are only pawns in the game. They do not suffer alone from the effects of monopoly. The whole Nation becomes impoverished.

PREVENTS DISCRIMINATION

A few rich, powerful corporations have forced manufacturers to sell goods at a lower price than sold to independent merchants. The purpose of this bill is to prevent price discrimination in favor of these monopolistic corporations. It prohibits, under certain conditions, the payment of brokerage fees to dummy brokers. It prohibits pseudo-advertising allowances. It gives the Federal Trade Commission additional powers in order that discrimination against independent dealers may be prevented. There is nothing in the measure to penalize, shackle, or discourage efficiency or to reward inefficiency. There is nothing in it to fix prices or limit the freedom of price movements in response to changing market conditions. It strengthens existing antitrust laws and preserves competition in interstate commerce. No business institution conducting its business honestly and without the use of unfair trade practices has any reason to fear the anti-chain-store bill.

HUGE SALARIES OF CHAIN-STORE OFFICERS

A few powerful organizations, by reason of their size, have forced manufacturers to give them special prices for the same quantities of goods. With the profit made by unfair trade practices these huge corporations are able to pay their executive officers million-dollar salaries and bonuses. Underpaid employees of these great corporations do not profit from price discriminations. The chains are the worst exploiters of labor that we have. Labor unions know that.

Evidence has been brought out in the committee and on the floor of the House to show that one large corporate chain paid a comparatively few of its officers and directors \$1,996,000 a year, paid several of them over \$100,000 a year, one of them \$180,000, another \$140,000, another \$52,000, and another \$25,000. The same concern received \$8,000,000 during the same year in secret rebates and in special discounts that the independent merchants of this country did not receive. They must keep their rebates secret in order that these huge salaries can be paid.

Chain stores undersell independent merchants in order to drive them out of business; then boost their prices again when the independent merchant is destroyed. To make up for losses incurred by underselling, higher prices are charged in areas where the chains already have a monopoly.

GROWING MONOPOLY

In the District of Columbia in 1933 the chains did 96.1 percent of the variety store business, 60.6 percent of the shoe store business, 79.9 percent of the grocery store business, 56.1 percent of the filling station business, and 62.7 percent of the drug store business. In every line of business, there was an increase from 1929 in the percentage done by chain stores, according to the figures of the United States Census Bureau.

At first, variety stores were the principal line of chains. Then came groceries, shoes, drugs, and others. When a chain is successful in one line, it expands into others. The continued growth of chains means absentee ownership of business throughout America. Some of our prominent economists estimate that the present rate of concentration by 1970 all business in this country will be controlled by 200 giant corporations. Already 200 corporations control the financial life of this Nation. These 200 corporations are controlled by a few superfineanciers.

CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH INCREASING

When the United States was first organized as a nation 2 percent of the people owned only 5 percent of the wealth and the other 98 percent owned 95 percent of the wealth. (Farmers' Union Herald, July 1935, quoting Hon. Charles A. Lindbergh, Sr.) Today it is estimated that 2 percent of the people own 80 percent of the wealth, instead of 5 percent at the beginning. We, the people, are beginning to lose the ownership of our country. We must prevent the spread of absentee ownership. Government is instituted among men to protect the weak and restrain the strong. Chain stores have been made strong by price discriminations and other unfair practices. Underpaid clerks receive no advantages from the huge profits of chains.

INDEPENDENT MERCHANTS AND INDEPENDENT BANKERS MUST BE SAVED

I am glad to serve on the steering committee of the Patman-Robinson anti-chain-store bill. I have always maintained that the independent merchant and the independent banker must be protected against the menace of chains.

Chain banks threaten to make character loans to merchants a thing of the past. The independent merchant today must deal with the agent of some huge banking chain. Chain banks have no personal interest in the needs of the local merchant. There is no bond of sympathy there. The independent merchant and the independent banker are facing the same enemy, monopolistic control. Chain monopolies are fast reducing them to the rank of clerk. Labor knows that the chains are notorious exploiters of labor. Labor unions are joining with independent merchants and independent bankers in their fight against monopoly.

I will support any organized effort to curb the chains, and I am glad to see some action taken in Congress to help the corner grocery, the drug store, the small merchant in general, and the independent banker. These men have helped

build our communities. They have extended a helping financial hand to deserving debtors. To eliminate them from American life would end a mighty chapter of community building and strike down a sturdy, independent American character.

LAKE CHAMPLAIN BRIDGE COMMISSION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 262, granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission. A similar House joint resolution was passed a moment ago, and I shall ask that the proceedings by which it was passed be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into the amendatory agreement executed on April 1, 1936, by the commissioners duly appointed on the part of such States, amending the original agreement entered into by such States for the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, which original agreement was consented to by Congress by Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, approved February 16, 1928, and every part and article of such amendatory agreement is hereby ratified, approved, and confirmed: *Provided,* That nothing therein contained shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of such amendatory agreement; which amendatory agreement is as follows:

Whereas the States of New York and Vermont heretofore and on the 11th day of May 1927, entered into an agreement or compact, duly authorized by law, creating the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission; and

Whereas the legislatures of said States have authorized their respective commissioners to enter into an agreement of compact amending said existing agreement or compact: Now, therefore,

The said States of New York and Vermont do hereby enter into the following agreement, to wit:

The agreement heretofore made between the State of New York and the State of Vermont, pursuant to chapter 321 of the Laws of 1927 of the State of New York, entitled "An act authorizing designated authorities in behalf of the State of New York to enter into an agreement or compact with designated authorities of the State of Vermont for the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, the establishment of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, and the defining of the powers and duties of such commission and making an appropriation for such purposes", and no. 139 of the acts of 1927 of the State of Vermont entitled "An act ratifying a proposed agreement or compact between the State of Vermont and the State of New York relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission and providing for carrying out the provisions of said agreement or compact", as the same was amended by the agreement or compact entered into the 30th day of March 1935, by and under the authority of chapter 201 of the Laws of 1933, as amended by chapter 355, of the Laws of 1935 of the State of New York, and by and under the authority of no. 209 of the acts of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont of 1935, entitled "An act authorizing an agreement or compact between the State of Vermont and the State of New York to amend the existing agreement or compact between said States creating the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission, in relation to the construction of a new bridge across Lake Champlain, the issuance of bonds by said Commission, and providing for the payment of said bonds", approved by the Governor February 27, 1935, as amended by no. 210 of the acts of 1935 of the General Assembly of the State of Vermont, approved by the Governor March 21, 1935, is hereby amended by adding thereto the following articles:

ARTICLE XXXVI

The Lake Champlain Bridge Commission shall have power and is hereby authorized to issue its negotiable bonds in addition to those issued prior to March 1, 1933, for the purpose of refunding its bonds issued before said date: *Provided, however,* That the aggregate principal amount of such bonds so issued to pay off and refund its bonds issued before said date shall not exceed the aggregate principal amount of the bonds so retired.

ARTICLE XXXVII

Such commission shall have power and is hereby authorized to call for payment and to pay its bonds issued before March 1, 1933, in accordance with the terms under which said bonds were issued and for such purposes to use any funds which it has or shall have in reserves and sinking fund and investments at the time said bonds are called for payment, notwithstanding any provision heretofore set forth in this or any previous compact or agreement.

ARTICLE XXXVIII

The bonds issued under authority of article XXXVI shall be authorized by resolution of such commission and shall bear such date or dates, mature at such time or times, not exceeding 50 years from their respective dates, bear interest at such rate or rates, not exceeding 5 percent per annum payable semiannually, be in such denominations, be in such form, either coupon or registered, carry such registration privileges, be executed in such manner, be payable in such medium of payment, at such place or places, and be subject to such terms of redemption as such resolution or resolutions may provide. Said bonds may be sold at public or private sale for such price or prices as such commission shall determine, provided that the interest cost to maturity of the money received for any issue of said bonds shall not exceed 5 percent per annum.

2. Neither the members of such commission nor any person executing said bonds shall be liable personally on said bonds or be subject to any personal liability or accountability by reason of the issuance thereof.

3. The bonds issued under the authority of article XXXVI shall constitute a first lien upon the property, tolls, and revenues pledged to secure the bonds issued by such commission prior to March 1, 1933, and subject to the terms of any agreement made or to be made with holders of bonds issued by such commission under article XXVI of the amendments to this compact shall be a lien upon the tolls and revenues of the bridge referred to as the Rouses Point Bridge, and in accordance with subdivision 4 of article XXVI of the amendments to this compact any of such tolls and revenues which would otherwise have been payable into the State treasuries of the two States may be pledged to the payment of said bonds.

4. Said bonds shall not be a debt of the State of New York or of the State of Vermont and neither State shall be liable thereon, nor shall they be payable out of any funds other than those of such commission.

5. Said bonds shall be exempt from taxation and are hereby made securities in which all public officers and bodies of each State and of its municipal subdivisions, all insurance companies and associations, all savings banks and savings institutions, including savings and loans associations, executors, administrators, guardians, trustees, and all other fiduciaries in each State may properly and legally invest the funds within their control.

6. Such commission shall have power out of any funds available therefor to purchase any bonds issued by it at a price not more than the redemption price thereof at the time of such purchase with accrued interest.

ARTICLE XXXIX

Such commission shall have the power to apply to the Congress of the United States or any department of the United States for consent or approval of this compact as amended, but in the absence of such consent by Congress and until the same shall have been secured, this compact, as amended, shall be binding upon the State of New York when ratified by it and the State of Vermont when ratified by it without the consent of Congress to cooperate for the purposes enumerated in this agreement and in the manner herein provided and for all purposes that it legally may be.

In witness whereof, by and under the authority of chapters 73 and 219 of the Laws of 1936, of the State of New York, and by and under the authority of Public Act No. 19 of the acts and resolves passed by the General Assembly of the State of Vermont at the special session 1935-36, approved by the Governor December 14, 1935, we have signed this compact or agreement, in duplicate, this 1st day of April 1936.

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings by which House Joint Resolution 582 was agreed to will be vacated.

There was no objection.

House Joint Resolution 582 was ordered to lie on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO PRINT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER], that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the so-called chain-store bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS AGAINST DR. TOWNSEND—MY VIEWS—REASON FOR VOTE AGAINST ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, frequently important matters are voted upon in the House without a record vote. In such cases, where the question is decided by voting without a roll call, there is no record that will indicate the manner in which any particular Member of the House has voted.

Realizing that there are a great many interested in the matter of how Members of Congress voted with respect to the resolution holding Dr. Townsend to be in contempt of the House of Representatives for having allegedly refused to testify before a special committee of the House investigating the so-called Townsend plan for old-age pensions, I have deemed it proper to make known my vote upon that occasion and the reason therefor, as no record vote was had.

I voted "no." My reason for having done so was based upon the thought that Dr. Townsend had not been treated fairly nor as considerately as he should have been by the committee when he appeared before them.

I am well aware that the dignity and the orderly procedure of the House requires that individuals, when properly summoned, must submit themselves before the House or any committee authorized and appointed by the House for the investigation of any particular matter. In the case of Dr. Townsend there was no refusal upon his part to appear before the duly authorized committee of the House that had been charged with the duty of investigating the so-called Townsend plan. In fact, he testified before the committee for 2 or more days. During this time he answered questions in a frank and straightforward manner. There was no attempt to hide, conceal, or evade anything that had a direct or indirect bearing upon the subject. The same was equally true of other witnesses who testified before the committee.

After Dr. Townsend had submitted himself for a long time before the committee and had answered innumerable questions addressed to him by committee members and the attorney representing the committee, he asked the privilege of reading into the record a prepared statement that would present in full his views and opinions, the aims and objects sought by the movement of which he is the head, and also information of a general character that would enable the committee to have full, complete, and comprehensive information on the subject. Dr. Townsend was of the opinion that such a plan of presentation would provide a more intelligent view of the entire matter than could be obtained by answering every conceivable question propounded by different members and which often had no relationship to one another. This method of examination produced a disjointed, disconnected, and necessarily incomplete and certainly unsatisfactory presentation.

I am of the opinion that the plan of procedure suggested by Dr. Townsend would have proved much more helpful in gaining accurate and complete knowledge than the course pursued by the committee. The adoption of the suggestion made by Dr. Townsend would not have prevented the committee from conducting a cross-examination after he had completed his prepared statement. Furthermore, the request that was made by Dr. Townsend was no different from that frequently made by witnesses appearing before congressional committees who desire to present a complete statement before interruption. I have never known such a request to be refused by any committee of which I have been a member. Dr. Townsend did not refuse to testify. He had already done so for a long time extending, if I remember correctly, into and possibly beyond a period of 2 days. It was only after having done so and having seen how unsatisfactory the procedure was in obtaining the real information sought that he made his request. It was reasonable from every standpoint. It should have been granted. If the committee had done so, there would have been no such issue as was presented to the House.

I am, therefore, of the opinion that even though there may have been, technically speaking, no legal right for Dr. Townsend to leave the presence of the committee without its consent; yet I am convinced that there was no wrongful intent upon his part in doing so. I can readily understand that he was exasperated at what he considered the unfriendly attitude of the committee and a procedure

that prevented a full and intelligent expression of his views, and that he took the course which he did only as a last resort. Again, I repeat that if the committee had granted his request it would not have curtailed its right to question Dr. Townsend after he had completed his statement; and if the committee had done so, the dignity of the committee and of this House would not have been detrimentally affected but, in fact, greatly enhanced.

It was for these reasons, which to me seemed fair and just, when the resolution to hold Dr. Townsend in contempt and authorizing and directing the United States District Attorney for the District of Columbia to institute legal proceedings therefor was brought before the House I voted "no."

PETITION TO DISCHARGE COMMITTEE

Furthermore, I wish to take this means of making known the fact that I signed the petition on the Clerk's desk of the House to discharge the committee of the McGroarty bill (Townsend plan) in order that the same might be brought before the House for consideration and vote.

As a Member of the House I have always been strongly of the opinion that any legislation that has a considerable number of citizens interested in its enactment should be brought upon the floor of the House for decision. To me, it seems fundamentally wrong that a few members of a committee should have the power to withhold action upon important matters of legislation and thereby preclude the membership of the House from the right to record its vote in favor of or against the proposed legislation.

This shall continue to be my course of action. It is based upon a principle of representative government that should find expression in all matters of legislation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DRISCOLL, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. POWERS (at the request of Mr. BACHARACH), for 3 days, on account of illness in family.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4511. An act to amend section 641 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 4512. An act to amend section 641 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. J. Res. 251. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the city and county of San Francisco to construct a causeway and highways on Yerba Buena Island in San Francisco Bay, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 11108. An act to advance a program of national safety and accident prevention.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11108. An act to advance a program of national safety and accident prevention.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 29, 1936, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

855. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of a ship canal connecting Lake Superior and Lake Michigan from Lake Au Train in Lake Superior to Little Bay de Noc in Lake Michigan, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

856. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Cedar Run Creek, N. J., from the Main Channel to Wire Creek, authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

857. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers on a preliminary examination of Obion and Forked Deer Rivers, and South Fork of Forked Deer River, Tenn., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

858. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of, and review of reports on, Greens Bayou and Pass Palacios (Cotton Bayou), Tex., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved August 30, 1935, and requested by resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted February 21, 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

859. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 26, 1936, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of Goldsborough Creek in Mason County, Wash., with a view to the control of its floods, authorized by act of Congress approved August 22, 1935; to the Committee on Flood Control.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. COLDEN: Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report 2833. Report from the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Department of the Interior (Rept. No. 2833). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 6731. A bill to create a United States Board of Awards and to provide for the presentation of certain medals; without amendment (Rept. No. 2839). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 1995. A bill to provide for the selection of certain lands in the State of California for the use of the California State park system; with amendment (Rept. No. 2840). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 11176. A bill increasing the penalty for making false oaths for the purpose of bathing at the Government free bathhouse at Hot Springs, Ark.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2841). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12426. A bill authorizing the payment of certain salaries and expenses of employees of the General Land Office; without amendment (Rept. No. 2842). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEARIN: Committee on the Public Lands. House Joint Resolution 496. Joint resolution for the erection of a memorial to Dr. Samuel Alexander Mudd; without amendment (Rept. No. 2843). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AYERS: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1871. An act granting certain public lands to the State of Montana for the use and benefit of the Northern Montana Agricultural and Manual Training School; without amendment (Rept. No. 2844). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MONTET: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 4252. An act to provide for the modification of the contract of lease entered into on June 12, 1922, between the United States and the Board of Commissioners of the Port of New Orleans; without amendment (Rept. No. 2858). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 608. Joint resolution extending for 2 years the time within which American claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the Mixed Claims Commission and the Tripartite Claims Commission, and extending until March 10, 1938, the time within which Hungarian claimants may make application for payment, under the Settlement of War Claims Act of 1928, of awards of the War Claims Arbitrator; without amendment (Rept. No. 2862). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on Roads. H. R. 12745. A bill to aid the several States in making certain toll bridges on the system of Federal-aid highways free bridges, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2863). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AYERS: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 554. Joint resolution authorizing distribution to the Indians of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in their favor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2864). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. AYERS: Committee on Indian Affairs. House Joint Resolution 557. Joint resolution authorizing distribution to the Gros Ventre Indians of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., of the judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in their favor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2865). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 12870. A bill to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936; without amendment (Rept. No. 2866). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PARSONS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 12604. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the four hundredth anniversary of the journey and explorations of Francisco Vasquez de Coronado; with amendment (Rept. No. 2867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 606. Joint resolution amending section 5 of Public Resolution No. 6, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved March 4, 1935; without amendment (Rept. No. 2869). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WEAVER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 12. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to divide the eastern district of South Carolina into four divisions and the western district into five divisions" by adding a new division to the eastern district and providing for terms of said court to be held at Orangeburg, S. C.; with amendment (Rept. No.

2870). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. Senate Joint Resolution 229. Joint resolution providing for the contribution by the United States to the expenses of the celebration by the State of Arkansas of its admission to the Federal Union; with amendment (Rept. No. 2871). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FREY: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 6612. A bill authorizing the appropriation of funds for the payment of claims of certain foreign governments under the circumstances hereinafter enumerated; with amendment (Rept. No. 2872). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6743. A bill for the relief of Mojo Schey Co., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2845). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7743. A bill for the relief of Mrs. David C. Stafford; with amendment (Rept. No. 2846). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9006. A bill for settlement of claim of Allen Holmes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2847). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PITTENGER: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9008. A bill for the relief of Milo Milliser; with amendment (Rept. No. 2848). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EVANS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9111. A bill for the relief of Evanell Durrance; with amendment (Rept. No. 2849). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10258. A bill for the relief of A. D. Hampton; with amendment (Rept. No. 2850). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10277. A bill for the relief of George E. Wilson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2851). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10916. A bill for the relief of Carl Hardin; with amendment (Rept. No. 2852). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10995. A bill for the relief of Elbert Arnold Jarrell; with amendment (Rept. No. 2853). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11262. A bill for the relief of Brooks-Callaway Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2854). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11861. A bill for the relief of Cleveland L. Short; without amendment (Rept. No. 2855). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12166. A bill for the relief of Mary Daley; with amendment (Rept. No. 2856). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PARSONS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. S. 3770. An act to award a special gold medal to Lincoln Ellsworth; with amendment (Rept. No. 2859). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PARSONS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 12388. A bill to provide for the recognition of the heroic conduct and devotion to duty of Matthew A. Hensen, one of the survivors of the polar expedition of Admiral Peary, and to provide a life pension for the said Matthew A. Hensen; with amendment (Rept. No. 2860). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. PARSONS: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. House Joint Resolution 123. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in commemoration of the

achievements of Amelia Earhart Putnam; with amendment (Rept. No. 2861). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KELLER: Committee on the Library. H. R. 4641. A bill authorizing the President to present a gold medal to George M. Cohan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McREYNOLDS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 10440. A bill for the relief of certain officers of the Foreign Service of the United States, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war or other causes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2873). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 7244. A bill for the relief of John E. T. Clark; with amendment (Rept. No. 2874). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8330. A bill for the relief of William Blakley; with amendment (Rept. No. 2875). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10330. A bill for the relief of the estate of John E. Callaway; with amendment (Rept. No. 2876). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 10746. A bill for the relief of Matt Burgess; with amendment (Rept. No. 2877). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11597. A bill for the relief of L. A. Peveler; with amendment (Rept. No. 2878). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 3080. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John W. Hubbard; without amendment (Rept. No. 2879). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3600. An act for the relief of S. C. Eastvold; without amendment (Rept. No. 2880). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3768. An act for the relief of E. W. Jermark; without amendment (Rept. No. 2881). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3850. An act for the relief of Mrs. Foster McLynn; without amendment (Rept. No. 2882). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 3956. An act for the relief of Jacob Kaiser; with amendment (Rept. No. 2883). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 4116. An act for the relief of Grant Anderson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2884). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. S. 4119. An act for the relief of Bernard F. Hickey; without amendment (Rept. No. 2885). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 4542. An act authorizing the Comptroller General of the United States to settle and adjust the claim of the Merritt-Chapman & Scott Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2886). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. Senate Joint Resolution 61. Joint resolution to repeal an act approved February 17, 1933, entitled "An act for the relief of Tampico Marine Iron Works", and to provide for the relief of William Saenger, chairman liquidating committee of the Beaumont Export & Import Co. of Beaumont, Tex.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2887). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 12884) to repeal the Silver Purchase Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 12885) to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL: A bill (H. R. 12886) to provide for the award of an air-mail service medal of honor; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MERRITT of New York: A bill (H. R. 12887) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in connection with the world's fair to be held in the city of New York, State of New York, in 1939, in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the inauguration of the first President of the United States of America and of the establishment of the Federal Government in the city of New York; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12888) to provide for the erection of a building to be used exclusively for the recorder of deeds; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHANDLER: A bill (H. R. 12889) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and to repeal section 76 thereof and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent therewith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER: A bill (H. R. 12890) extending the benefits for veterans of the Spanish-American War, including the Philippine Insurrection and the China Relief Expedition, to contract veterinarians; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12891) granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wilkerson's Ferry, Miss.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CARMICHAEL: A bill (H. R. 12892) to quiet title and possession with respect to certain lands in Lawrence County, Ala., to wit, all of fractional section 25 which lies south of the Elk River Shoals Canal and the northwest quarter of section 36, township 3 south, range 7 west, Huntsville meridian; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIMOND (by request): A bill (H. R. 12893) for the protection of oyster culture in Alaska; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HILDEBRANDT: A bill (H. R. 12894) to transfer the duties, powers, and functions of the Secretary of Commerce under the Air Commerce Act of 1926, as amended, to the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington: A bill (H. R. 12895) to authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of certain facilities for navigation on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCORMACK: A bill (H. R. 12896) to provide for the transfer of the surplus decommissioned Lightship No. 82 to U. S. S. Constitution Post No. 3339, Veterans of Foreign Wars; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MAIN: A bill (H. R. 12897) providing a special tax on retail liquor sales in the District of Columbia to establish there a suitable home for inebriates; to maintain dependent wives and minor children of inebriates; to provide home relief for widows and orphans of inebriates; and to pay adjudicated claims for injury or death caused, in part or major degree, by persons under the influence of intoxicating liquors within the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12898) granting the consent of Congress to the Mackinac Straits Bridge Authority, to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge or series of bridges, causeways, and approaches thereto,

across the Straits of Mackinac at or near a point between St. Ignace, Mich., and the lower peninsula of Michigan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNUTE HILL: A bill (H. R. 12899) to authorize completion, maintenance, and operation of certain facilities for navigation on the Columbia River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CHURCH (by request): A bill (H. R. 12900) to amend section 4898 of the Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. McSWAIN: A bill (H. R. 12901) to grant United States mail franking privilege to Reserve officers in official correspondence; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 12902) to provide a commissioned strength for the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for the efficient performance of military and other statutory duties assigned to that corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CONNERY: Resolution (H. Res. 533) providing for the consideration of House Resolution 49, a resolution requesting the Secretary of Labor to compile a list of the labor-saving devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Resolution (H. Res. 534) to authorize payment of expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 527; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LUCKEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 609) to establish a policy of national defense; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KOPPLEMANN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 610) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1936, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILCHRIST: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 51) providing for the printing as a House document of the opinions of the Supreme Court of the United States (including dissenting opinions and separate concurring opinions) on various cases; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. KRAMER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 52) creating a joint committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives to determine the practicability of the purchase of Lower California from the Republic of Mexico; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERLIN: A bill (H. R. 12903) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 12904) validating a town-lot certificate and authorizing and directing issuance of a patent for the same to Ernest F. Brass; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DEROUEN: A bill (H. R. 12905) for the relief of certain purchasers of lots in Harding town site, Florida, and for the relief of the heirs of Lewis G. Norton; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: A bill (H. R. 12906) granting a pension to Mary Averbek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 12907) for the relief of Paul Glick; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11005. By Mr. COLDEN: Resolution adopted by the San Pedro Civic Council, of San Pedro, Calif., urging the appropriation or allocation of funds for the construction of the proposed Great T Tunnel for the purpose of connecting the highways of the Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbor districts, shortening distances and speeding up and facilitating

traffic between points in said districts now isolated by water, and to and from communities adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Roads.

11006. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of Council No. 15, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, deploring existing conditions which if not curbed threaten the very existence of our American Republic, opposing enactment of the Kerr bill and favoring the Reynolds-Starnes bill; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

11007. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers, International Falls, Local No. 159; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

11008. Also, petition of Mother's Day, Inc., Philadelphia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11009. Also, petition of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local No. 1445; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11010. Also, petition of the city of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 29, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 28, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Haltigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 4533. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wikerson's Ferry, Miss.; and

S. J. Res. 262. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8442. An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes;

H. R. 11916. An act to authorize the transfer of a certain piece of land in Muhlenberg County, Ky., to the State of Kentucky; and

H. J. Res. 589. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the transportation of bonded merchandise by other than common carriers under certain conditions.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Brown	Connally	Gibson
Ashurst	Bulkeley	Coolidge	Glass
Austin	Bulow	Copeland	Guffey
Bachman	Burke	Couzens	Hale
Bailey	Byrd	Davis	Hastings
Barbour	Byrnes	Dieterich	Hatch
Barkley	Capper	Duffy	Hayden
Benson	Caraway	Fletcher	Holt
Bilbo	Carey	Frazier	Johnson
Black	Chavez	George	Keyes
Borah	Clark	Gerry	King

La Follette	Minton	Reynolds	Townsend
Loftin	Murphy	Robinson	Truman
Loneragan	Murray	Russell	Tydings
Long	Neely	Schwellenbach	Vandenberg
McAdoo	Norris	Sheppard	Van Nuys
McGill	O'Mahoney	Shipstead	Wagner
McKellar	Overton	Smith	Walsh
McNary	Pittman	Steiger	Wheeler
Maloney	Pope	Thomas, Okla.	White
Metcalf	Radcliffe	Thomas, Utah	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHEY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE (S. DOC. NO. 255)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Commerce, fiscal year 1937, amounting to \$50,000 (salaries and expenses, General Committee of the Accident Prevention Conference), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY (S. DOC. NO. 256)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, to remain available until June 30, 1937, for the Bureau of Plant Industry, Department of Agriculture, amounting to \$100,000, for the purchase of land and equipment and construction of buildings required in connection with sugarcane investigations, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture to liberalize the terms of the National Soil Conservation Act so as to permit farmers in areas wherein drought has prevented germination or growth of their principal money crop until it is too late to produce such crops, even if rain should come, to withdraw a greater percentage of such soil depleting crops from cultivation and to plant same to soil building or soil improving crops as outlined in the terms of said act

Whereas there is now and has been for well-nigh 2 months a serious drought affecting certain States of the Nation, particularly South Carolina, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Virginia, and portions of Alabama, Florida, and other States so vitally and adversely as to make the growing of certain crops, such as cotton, tobacco, corn, and so forth, almost impossible for the year 1936, due to the lateness of the season; and

Whereas these crops are largely the money crops of the affected areas and vitally influence the business life of the said States and the individuals dependent upon them for sustenance, as well as the economic life of the Nation as a whole; and

Whereas, if some measure of relief is not devised for the farmers of the affected areas, the likelihood is that the relief rolls in these areas will be greatly augmented this fall as a result of money crop failures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina hereby strongly petitions, urges, and recommends to the national Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture that the National Soil Conservation Act be so liberalized or amended as to allow a greater percentage of soil depleting crops to be withdrawn from cultivation and planted to soil building and soil improving crops than is now allowable under the said act, such increased percentage of soil depleting crops to